arXiv:1610.07908v2 [cs.CC] 27 Oct 2016

A pumping lemma for non-cooperative self-assembly

Pierre-Étienne Meunier
Aalto University
pierre-etienne.meunier@aalto.fi *

Damien Regnault
Université d'Évry Val-d'Essonne
damien.regnault@ibisc.fr †

Abstract

We prove here a result which strongly hints at the computational weakness of a model of tile assembly that has so far resisted many attempts of formal analysis or positive constructions. Specifically, we prove that, in Winfree's abstract Tile Assembly Model, when restricted to use only noncooperative bindings, any long enough path starting from the seed that can grow in all terminal assemblies is *pumpable*, meaning that this path can be extended into an infinite, ultimately periodic path.

This result can be seen as a geometric generalization of the pumping lemma of finite state automata, and is a great step to solve the question of what can be computed deterministically in this model. Moreover, this question has motivated the development of a new method called *visible glues*. We believe that this method can also be used to tackle other long-standing problems in computational geometry, in relation for instance with self-avoiding paths.

Tile assembly (including non-cooperative tile assembly) was originally introduced by Winfree and Rothemund in STOC 2000 to understand how to *program shapes*. The *non-cooperative* variant, also known as *temperature 1 tile assembly*, is the model where tiles are allowed to bind as soon as they match on one side, whereas in cooperative tile assembly, some tiles need to match on several sides in order to bind. Previously, exactly one known result (SODA 2014) showed a restriction on the assemblies general non-cooperative self-assembly could achieve, without any implication on its computational expressiveness. With non-square tiles (like polyominos, SODA 2015), other recent works have shown that the model quickly becomes computationally powerful.

*Aalto University, Helsinki, Finland and Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, LIF UMR 7279, 13288, Marseille, France. Supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant CCF-1219274.

†Université d'Évry Val-d'Essonne, IBISC EA 4526, 91037, Évry, France. Supported in part by ANR project Quasicool (ANR-12-JS02-011-01)

1 Introduction

A possible approach to natural sciences is to try and write programs using the same kind of programming language as we think nature uses. If we can implement our theoretical algorithms in the actual natural systems, we will know the theory is meaningful to the systems studied. Through this process, we can learn from theorems *reasons why* something is true, yielding insights beyond the *modeling* of observed phenomena. This approach contrasts with other approaches where natural scientists test hypotheses against experiments to understand *what happens*.

Although present since Turing [24]'s and Von Neumann's [26] works, this idea has really been able to develop and extend into physical realizations only in recent years. One of these realizations is the first implementation of Shor's algorithm in 2001 [25], providing a precious link between techniques for programming qubits devised by computer scientists, and the bricks actually used by nature. Another achievement is the connection observed by Winfree in 1998 [27] between core concepts from theoretical computer science (computing machines, tilings) and a kind of building bricks devised by Seeman [21] using DNA. One of the main models used in this connection, called the *abstract Tile Assembly Model*, has yielded an impressive number of experimental demonstrations [19, 28, 29].

Although they use different concepts and tools, these works use the same approach: trying to write programs using the language of nature (of physics in the former case, of chemistry in the latter), and confront these programs to the physical world by implementing them.

In this work, we study a long-standing open problem from the second approach by showing that a simple version of the programming language of tile assembly, although ubiquitous in many systems, is almost surely not able to perform computation. More precisely, in the abstract Tile Assembly Model, we are interested in the interactions and bindings of grounds of matter represented by square tiles, with glues of a certain *color* and integer *strength* on each of their four borders. The dynamics start from an initial assembly called the *seed*, and proceeds asynchronously and nondeterministically, one tile at a time, according to the following rule: a tile may attach to the current assembly if the sum of glue strengths on its sides that match the colors of adjacent tiles sum up to at least a parameter of the model called the temperature $\tau = 1, 2, 3 \ldots$. In particular, this means that unlike in Wang tilings (one inspiration of this model), adjacent tiles may have a *mismatch*, i.e. disagree on the glue types of their common border.

This model is an abstraction of a simple chemical fact: when the temperature of a solution is increased, so is molecular agitation; for a tile to stay stably attached to an assembly, it needs then either stronger bonds to that assembly, or bonds to a larger neighborhood.

Temperature 1 This work will exclusively focus on *temperature 1* tile assembly, also called *non-cooperative* self-assembly. At higher temperatures, fewer assemblies are stable, allowing more control over producible assemblies: indeed, temperature 2 self-assembly is able to simulate arbitrary Turing machines [14, 20, 27], and produce arbitrary connected shapes with a number of tile types within a log factor of their Kolmogorov complexity [23]. More surprisingly, this model has even been shown intrinsically universal [6], meaning that there is a single tileset capable of simulating arbitrary tile assembly systems, modulo rescaling. In generalizations of this model, a single tile can even be sufficient to simulate all tile assembly systems and therefore all Turing

machines [5].

In all known generalizations of the model, non-cooperative self-assembly is capable of arbitrary Turing computation: 3D cubic tiles [4], stochastic assembly sequences [4], hierarchical self-assembly [2], polyominoes [8], duples [11], tiles with signals [12], geometric tiles [10] or negative glues [17]. Moreover, the synchronous version of this model can simulate arbitrary cellular automata.

The framework of intrinsic simulations (i.e. simulations up to rescaling) has recently yielded the first proof of a qualitative (and indeed geometric) difference between non-cooperative tile assembly and the more general model [16]. However, that result had no computational implications: indeed, it also holds in the three-dimensional generalization of temperature 1, known to be Turing-universal [4].

Therefore, an absolute requirement to understand this model seems to be an intuition on the role of planarity, and the shape of tiles. Here, we introduce a new framework to study how information can be communicated in a planar space, via geometric interactions. This framework will then (in the end of our proof) allow us to abstract geometric considerations away and reason on large boxes in which paths are forced to grow. This is a significant progress in the field, since the "low-level geometry" of paths producible at temperature 1 has been notoriously difficult to understand.

Relation to other works Doty, Patitz and Summers conjectured [7]: *for all temperature 1 directed tile assembly systems, there is a constant c such that all paths longer than c producible by the system are pumpable.* They also have shown that if this conjecture is true then the set of producible assemblies of temperature 1 directed tile assembly systems is therefore semi-linear, and hence computationally simple.

Moreover, counting and sampling self-avoiding walks in the plane is an old problem at the intersection polymer chemistry and computer science, introduced by Flory [9]; an early attempt to solve it was made by Knuth [13], and this field has remained active today [1]. Another interpretation of our questions is the following problem, related to these works: starting from any point in $\mathbb{Z}^2$, start a self-avoiding walk deterministically (with memory). How far can you go without ever entering a cycle, if you only have n bits of memory?

1.1 Main result

Our result can be seen as a two-dimensional equivalent of the pumping lemma on deterministic finite automata [22]: we prove that if a non-cooperative tile assembly system can *always* grow assemblies over a certain size (depending only on the size of their seed and on the number of tile types used), then these paths can be extended into ultimately periodic paths.

However, remark that non-cooperative systems can grow at least the same assemblies as cooperative ones: intuitively, their growth is "harder to control", resulting in more possible assemblies. This is why our result is specific to patterns that can grow *in all assemblies* producible by the system:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ be a tile assembly system such that the seed assembly σ is finite and connected. There is a constant $c(|T|, |\mathrm{dom}(\sigma)|)$ such that any path P, that can grow in all assemblies of $\mathcal{T}$ and reaches a point at a distance more than $c(|T|, \sigma)$ from σ, is* pumpable.

This result is different from the conjecture of Doty, Patitz and Summers since our paths starts from the seed. Nevertheless, using the tools developed in this paper, we think that our result is sufficient to prove that the set of producible assemblies of temperature 1 directed tile assembly systems is semi-linear. We will provide this result within a few months.

The term *pumpable* will be defined in Section 2. Intuitively, we say that P is pumpable if one of its subpaths $P_{i,i+1,\dots,j}$ can be repeated infinitely many times immediately after $P_{1,2,\dots,j-1}$, without *conflicting* with σ nor with $P_{1,2,\dots,j-1]}$, nor with any other repetition.

2 Definitions and basic properties

In this section, we give the definitions necessary to formalize the main result and some fundamental properties which will be used all along the article. First, we remind the classical notations on the $2D$ grid. Then, we introduce non-cooperative tile assembly and assemblies using standard formalism. Finally, we define path assemblies, fragility and pumpability. All the figures of this section are in appendix B.

2.1 Graphs and paths

Graphs. Let G be the grid graph of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, i.e. the undirected graph whose vertices are the points of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, and for any two points $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, there is an edge between A and B if and only if $||AB|| = \max(|x_B - x_A|, |y_B - y_A|) = 1$. Note that along the article, we will exclusively use the maximum norm, *i.e.* $||(x, y)|| = \max(|x|, |y|)$. An element of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is called a *position*. For any graph G', we will denote by $V(G')$ the set of its vertices and by $E(G')$ the set of its edges (for example, $V(G) = \mathbb{Z}^2$). Consider two graphs G^1 and G^2, G^1 is a *subgraph* of G^2 if and only if $V(G^1) \subset V(G^2)$ and $E(G^1) \subset E(G^2)$. All the graphs considered in this article are subgraph of the grid graph G. The union of G^1 and G^2 is the graph $(G^1 \cup G^2) = (V(G^1) \cup V(G^2), E(G^1) \cup E(G^2))$ (see Figure 2). All graphs considered in this article are connected and when the union of two graphs is done, the resulting graph will still be connected. For any position $A \in V(G)$, we denote x_A its abscissa and by y_A its ordinate, *i.e.* $A = (x_A, y_A)$. For a graph G', we denote by $x_{G'} = \min\{x_A : A \in V(G')\}$ if this value is finite and $X_{G'} = \max\{x_A : A \in V(G')\}$ if this value is finite (see Figure 2). The notations $y_{G'}$ and $Y_{G'}$ are defined similarly. Consider a vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the translation of G' by $\overrightarrow{v}$ is the graph $G' + \overrightarrow{v}$ where $V(G' + \overrightarrow{v}) = \{A + \overrightarrow{v} = A \in V(G)\}$ and $E(G' + \overrightarrow{v}) = \{(x + \overrightarrow{v}, y + \overrightarrow{v}) : (x, y) \in E(G')\}$. If the graph G' is finite then its size is $|G'| = |V(G')|$.

Paths. Since any path P is also a graph, then all paths considered in this article are a subgraph of the grid graph G and all the previous notations can also be used to study paths. A *simple* path is a path with no loop. We will often represent a path as a sequence of vertices: if P is finite we denote it as $(P_i)_{1 \leq i \leq |P|}$ where for all $1 \leq i \leq |P|$, $P_i \in V(P)$, for all $1 \leq i \leq |P| - 1$, $(P_i, P_{i+1}) \in E(P)$ and for all $2 \leq i \leq |P| - 1$, $P_{i-1} \neq P_{i+1}$. We call such a representation of P, an *indexing* of P. Remark that since P is a non-oriented path, then if $V(P)$ is finite there exists two possible indexing of P and along the article, we will precise which indexing is considered if necessary. When $V(P)$ is infinite, defining an indexing is more complex and two main cases may occur. In the first case, there exists a vertex of $V(P)$ with only one neighbor in P, then we say that P is *infinite* and there exists an indexing $(P_i)_{1 \leq i}$ of P where P_1 is the vertex with one neighbors in P (see Figure 3a). In the second case, all vertices of P possess two neighbors in P

and then we say that P is *bi-infinite* and an indexing $(P_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of P (see Figure 3b) is defined as follow: one position of $V(P)$ is labeled with the index 0 and one of the two possible orientations of the path has to be chosen. In this case, there exists an infinity of possible indexing.

Some proofs will require to consider a lot of different indices of the path, thus we introduce a specific notation to write them, let $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ to denote a specific index $\mathbf{1}$ of the indexing of P. Consider a path P and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ of P, we write $[\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}] = \{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}+1, \ldots, \mathbf{2}\}$ and the notation $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ designs the path Q where $|Q| = \mathbf{2} - \mathbf{1} + 1$ and for all $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |Q|$ we have $Q_{\mathbf{3}} = Q_{\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{3}-1}$. Note that the path Q is a subgraph of P, we say that Q is a *segment* of P. Consider an index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = (x, y)$ then we denote by $x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} = x$ and by $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} = y$. A path P is simple if and only if for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$, we have $P_{\mathbf{1}} \neq P_{\mathbf{2}}$.

Concerning the union of two paths P and Q, remark that $P \cup Q$ is not necessary a path. To avoid this problem, we introduce a specific operation to replace the union of two paths. Consider two paths P and Q such that $P_{|P|} = Q_1$ (resp. $P_{|P|} = Q_{|Q|}$), then the path $R = P \cdot Q$, called the *concatenation* of P and Q, is the path of length $|P|+|Q|-1$ such that for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ we have $R_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and for all $|P| \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P| + |Q| - 1$, we have $R_{\mathbf{1}} = Q_{\mathbf{1}-|P|+1}$ (resp. $R_{\mathbf{1}} = Q_{|Q|+|P|-\mathbf{1}}$). In this case, the concatenation of two paths is still a path. Nevertheless, remark that the concatenation of two simple paths is not necessary a simple path (see Figure 4).

For a finite path P, the *direction* of P is $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_1 P_{|P|}}$. Along the article, we will often need to extend a path P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ into an infinite or a bi-infinite path. To achieve this goal remark that making the concatenation $P \cdot (P + \overrightarrow{v})$ is possible. Then, we can introduce the following notations (see Figure 5): the paths $P^{+\omega} = \cdot_{0\leq i}(P + i\overrightarrow{v})$, $P^{*+\omega} = \cdot_{1\leq i}(P + i\overrightarrow{v})$, $P^{-\omega} = \cdot_{0\leq i}(P - i\overrightarrow{v})$ and $P^{*-\omega} = \cdot_{1\leq i}(P - i\overrightarrow{v})$ are infinite paths and the path $P^{\omega} = \cdot_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}(P + i\overrightarrow{v})$ is a bi-infinite path. These five paths are called the *extensions* of P. Moreover, we generally need for these paths to be simple. Fortunately, there exists an easy test to determine if extending a finite path will generate a simple path: if P is simple and $V(P) \cap V(P + \overrightarrow{v}) = P_{|P|}$ then all its extensions are simple. This result was proven in [5]. We formalize this result in the following definition and lemma.

Definition 2.1. Consider a finite path P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$, we say that P is a *good* path if and only if P is simple, finite and $V(P) \cap V(P + \overrightarrow{v}) = P_{|P|}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Consider a good path P then $P^{+\omega}$, $P^{*+\omega}$, $P^{-\omega}$, $P^{*-\omega}$ and P^{ω} are simple paths.*

Remark that, the extensions of a finite path P are periodic. We will always consider an indexing of an extension of P with the following property:

Fact 2.3. Consider a finite path P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and let $\ell = |P| - 1$, then for all $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $P^{\omega}_{\mathbf{1}+\ell} = P^{\omega}_{\mathbf{1}} + \overrightarrow{v}$.

Finally, consider a path P and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ then the notation $P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ designs $(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]})^{*+\omega}$, *i.e.* the extension of the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of path P.

2.2 The abstract Tile Assembly Model.

A *tile type* is a unit square with four sides, each consisting of a *glue label* and a nonnegative integer strength (see figure 6a). Formally, a tile $t = (n, e, s, o)$ is an element of $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{N})^4$, where

$\mathcal{G}$ is a finite set of glue labels. Moreover, n is called its *north glue*, e its *east glue*, s its *south glue* and w its *west glue*.

Let T be a finite set of tile types (see figure 7). An *assembly over* T is a partial function of $\mathbb{Z}^2 \dashrightarrow T$, whose domain is a connected component of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Intuitively, an assembly is a positioning of tile types at some positions in the plane (see figure 8a).

We say that two neighboring tiles of an assembly *interact* if the glue labels on their abutting side are equal, and have positive strength (see figure 6b). An assembly α induces a weighted *binding graph* $G_\alpha = (V_\alpha, E_\alpha)$, where $V_\alpha = \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)$, and there is an edge $(a, b) \in E_\alpha$ if and only if tiles a and b interact. An assembly α is said to be τ*-stable* if any cut of G_α has weight at least τ.

A *tile assembly system* is a triple $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, \tau)$, where T is a finite tile set, σ is a τ-stable assembly called the seed, and $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ is the temperature. In this paper, τ will always be equal to 1.

Given two τ-stable assemblies α and β, we say that α is a *subassembly* of β, and write $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta$ if $\mathrm{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\beta)$, and for all position $p \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)$, $\alpha(p) = \beta(p)$. We also write $\alpha \to_1^{\mathcal{T}} \beta$ if $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta$ and $|\mathrm{dom}(\beta) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)| = 1$ (i.e. if we can obtain β from α by a single tile attachment).

We say that β is *producible* from α, and write $\alpha \to^{\mathcal{T}} \beta$ (or simply $\alpha \to \beta$ if there is no ambiguity), if there is a (possibly empty) sequence $\alpha = \alpha_0 \to_1^{\mathcal{T}} \alpha_1 \to_1^{\mathcal{T}} \ldots \to_1^{\mathcal{T}} \alpha_{n-1} = \beta$. The set of *productions* of a tile assembly system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, \tau)$ is $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{T}] = \{\alpha | \sigma \to^{\mathcal{T}} \alpha\}$. Moreover, an assembly α is called *terminal* if there is no β such that $\alpha \to_1^{\mathcal{T}} \beta$, and the set of productions of a tile assembly system $\mathcal{T}$, that are terminal assemblies, is written $\mathcal{A}_\square[\mathcal{T}]$. A tile assembly system is *deterministic* if it has exactly one (potentially infinite) terminal assembly.

Note that the notations introduced for graph in section 2.1 can be adapted to assembly. For example, consider an assembly α, then $X_\alpha = \max\{x_A : A \in V(G_\alpha)\}$. Only the union of two assemblies involves a subtle technical difficulty, that can be easily dealt with using proper vocabulary. When assemblies overlap, two different things can happen: either the assemblies disagree on the tile types they place at their common positions, or they agree. Consider two assemblies α and β such that there is a position $A \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha) \cap \mathrm{dom}(\beta)$, we say that α and β intersect at position A. If $\alpha(A) \neq \beta(A)$, we say that α and β *conflict* at position A. On the other hand, we say that α and β *agree* at position A if $\alpha(A) = \beta(A)$. If two assemblies α and β agree on all their common positions, i.e. if there is an assembly γ such that $\alpha \sqsubseteq \gamma$, $\beta \sqsubseteq \gamma$ and $\mathrm{dom}(\gamma) = \mathrm{dom}(\alpha) \cup \mathrm{dom}(\beta)$ is connected, we write $\alpha \cup \beta$ for this assembly γ (see figure 9).

2.3 Path assemblies

An important point about temperature 1 tile assembly, is that any path in the binding graph of an assembly can start to grow, independent from anything else. More precisely, if $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ is a tile assembly system, then for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}[\mathcal{T}]$, and any path P in the binding graph of α such that P_1 is in σ, an immediate induction on the length of P shows that the restriction of α to $(\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \cup P)$ is in $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{T}]$.

Since assemblies following paths are particularly important in our proof, we define them now using *sequences* instead of the more general formalism of *assemblies*: first, for any element $a = (p, t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times T$, we call p the *position* of a, written $\mathrm{pos}(a)$, and t the *type* of a, written as $\mathrm{type}(a)$. We also write the position of a as (x_a, y_a). Let then $P = (P_i)_{1 \leq i \leq |P|}$ be any sequence of $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times T$. If for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$, we have $\mathrm{pos}(P_\mathbf{1}) = \mathrm{pos}(P_\mathbf{2}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{type}(P_\mathbf{1}) = \mathrm{type}(P_\mathbf{2})$ and

$\text{dom}(P) = \bigcup_{1\leq i\leq |P|}(\text{pos}(P_i))$ is connected, we define the assembly *induced* by a sequence P as the assembly α_P such that $\text{dom}(\alpha_P) = \text{dom}(P)$ and for all i, $\alpha(\text{pos}(P_i)) = \text{type}(P_i)$. We call the sequence of positions $(\text{pos}(P_i))_{i\in\{1,2,\dots,|P|\}}$ the *underlying path* of P. Moreover, if the underlying path of P is a path and if P induces an assembly α_P such that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |P| - 1\}$, the tiles at positions (x_i, y_i) and (x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}) in α_P interact, we call P a path assembly (even though not formally an assembly, since a path assembly is a sequence of $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times T$, and an assembly is a function of $\mathbb{Z}^2 \to T$), see Figure 10. The binding graph of P is the binding of α_P. A path assembly P is *simple* if and only if its underlying path is a simple path. Abusively, we denote the assembly $\alpha_P \cup \sigma$ by $P \cup \sigma$. Then, a path assembly P is producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ if only if there is no conflict between P and σ and the assembly $P \cup \sigma$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$. The distance from a path assembly to the seed is defined by $\max\{||AB|| : A \in \text{dom}(P) \text{ and } B \in \text{dom}(\sigma)\}$.

Also, notations used for paths and assemblies have a counterpart for path assemblies. For example, we denote by $Y_P = \max_{1\leq i\leq |P|}\{y_{P_i}\}$ and for any two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$, we denote by $Q = P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ the path assembly of length $\mathbf{2} - \mathbf{1} + 1$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \mathbf{2} - \mathbf{1} + 1$, we have $Q_i = P_{\mathbf{1}+i}$. The path assembly $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is called a *segment* of the path assembly P and the assembly induced by $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a subassembly of the assembly induced by P. Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if $\text{pos}(P_1) \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$ then for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, the path assembly $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}]}$ is also producible by this tiling system. This is not necessary the case of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ with $1 < \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$. Consider two path assemblies P and P' such that $P_{|P|} = P'_1$, then the concatenation of P and P' is defined as the sequence $Q = P \cdot P'$ such that $|Q| = |P| + |P'| - 1$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq |P|$, we have $Q_i = P_i$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq |P'|$, we have $Q_{i+|P|-1} = P'_i$. Note that the sequence Q is not a path assembly if there is a conflict between P and P'. If all intersections between P and P' are agreements then Q is also a path assembly. Also note that P can be producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T}$ but not the path assembly Q, this event occurs when P' collides with the seed. Finally, remark that the concatenation of two simple path assemblies which are in agreement is not necessarily simple.

Extending a finite path assembly into an infinite or bi-infinite sequence is more complex than extending a path. First, the *direction* of a finite path assembly is $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{\text{pos}(P_1)\text{pos}(P_{|P|})}$ (in the rest of the article, we will abusively denote by $\overrightarrow{P_iP_j}$ the vector $\overrightarrow{\text{pos}(P_i)\text{pos}(P_j)}$). Secondly, a path assembly P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ is a *candidate* if and only if P is finite, its direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ is not null and $\text{type}(P_1) = \text{type}(P_{|P|})$. Consider a candidate path assembly P, then we introduce the extensions of P as $P^{+\omega} = \cdot_{0\leq i}(P + i\overrightarrow{v})$, $P^{*+\omega} = \cdot_{1\leq i}(P + i\overrightarrow{v})$, $P^{-\omega} = \cdot_{0\leq i}(P - i\overrightarrow{v})$ and $P^{*-\omega} = \cdot_{1\leq i}(P - i\overrightarrow{v})$ which are infinite sequences and $P^{\omega} = \cdot_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}(P + i\overrightarrow{v})$ which is a bi-infinite sequence. These extensions are correctly defined if and only if P is a candidate path assembly. Similarly to what has been done to path, we introduce good path assemblies:

Definition 2.4. Consider a path assembly P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$, we say that P is a *good* path assembly if and only if P is simple, finite, $\text{dom}(P) \cap \text{dom}(P + \overrightarrow{v}) = \text{pos}(P_{|P|})$ and a candidate path assembly.

Lemma 2.5. *Consider a good path assembly P then $P^{+\omega}$, $P^{*+\omega}$, $P^{-\omega}$, $P^{*-\omega}$ and P^{ω} are simple path assemblies.*

Moreover, the periodicity of the extensions of P are summarized in the following fact:

Fact 2.6. Consider a candidate path assembly P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and let $\ell = |P| - 1$, then for all $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $P^{\omega}_{\mathbf{1}+\ell} = P^{\omega}_{\mathbf{1}} + \overrightarrow{v}$.

2.4 Fragility and pumpability

We now define the two properties of path assemblies that we will study along the article and we discuss some fundamental facts. First a path assembly is fragile if it is does not appear in all terminal assembly.

Definition 2.7 (Fragility)**.** Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ be a tile assembly system. We say that a path assembly P is *fragile* when there is at least one terminal assembly $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\square}[\mathcal{T}]$ of which the assembly induced by P is not a subassembly.

According to this definition, if an assembly admits a non-fragile path assembly, then it can always be produced from any assembly. An efficient and practical way to prove the fragility of a path assembly P is to find another path assembly P' which is in conflict with P (see figure 11).

Fact 2.8. Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if there exists another path assembly P' producible by $\mathcal{T}$ such that P and P' are in conflict then P is fragile.

Note that in this case P' is also fragile and the tiling system is not deterministic. Now, the segment of a path assembly is pumpable if it is possible to extend it infinitely (see figure 12a).

Definition 2.9 (Pumpability)**.** Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ be a temperature 1 tile assembly system, and P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$, of length at least 2 and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$. The segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of P is pumpable if and only if it is a candidate segment and either the sequence $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot P^{+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ or the sequence $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot P^{*-\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$.

Since our representation of a path assembly implicitly implies an orientation of its underlying path, we have two distinguish two cases for pumpability. Consider a segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ of a path assembly P, then the segment can be pumped in direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 12a) or in direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 12b). In the second case, we call this operation *reverse pumping*. Reserve pumping will be used only one time in the proof of lemma 4.29. Otherwise, we will always pump a segment of a path assembly according to the direction of the path assembly. Also, in this definition, we require that $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ whereas in some cases, it is possible to pump segment of length 1. Nevertheless, we will never consider such segments along the proof.

There is a subtlety to define the pumpability of a path assembly or an assembly. Indeed, if a path assembly contains a pumpable segment then it is not necessary "pumpable": it could be fragile. For example the path assembly of Figure 12a is in conflict with the assembly P of figure 10. The following definition take this case into account.

Definition 2.10 (Pumpability or fragility)**.** Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ be a temperature 1 tile assembly system, and P a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$. The path assembly P is *fragile or pumpable* if and only if P is fragile or there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a pumpable candidate segment. Moreover, consider β an assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$, we say that β is *fragile or pumpable* if and only if β is fragile or if there exists a path assembly P such that $\alpha_P \sqsubseteq \beta$ and P is fragile or pumpable.

Consider a path assembly P and a candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of P. In the best case, this segment is pumpable and we have obtained the desired result. Otherwise, remark that $Q = P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot P^{\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a sequence where two consecutive tiles interact, then if Q is not a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then $P^{\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ creates at least one conflict. We need to know the exact position of this conflict. If several conflicts exist, we are interested in the first one (see Figure 13).

Definition 2.11. Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of P which is not pumpable. Let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$, then the first conflict of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is the index $1 \leq \mathbf{3}$ such that $\mathbf{3} = \min\{i : P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]} \cdot Q_{[1,i]}$ is not producible by $\mathcal{T}\}$.

Note that this definition implies that $\mathbf{3} > 1$. Also, we do not consider reverse pumping for this definition since reverse pumping is marginal. Two kinds of obstacle may prevent the candidate segment to be pumpable, either the sequence Q is not a path assembly (Q conflicts with itself) or Q is a path assembly which conflicts with $\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$. We now show that whatever happens the first conflict always occurs in the domain of $\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$. This result is due to the periodicity of Q.

Lemma 2.12. *Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of P which is not pumpable. Let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ be the first conflict of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$, then* $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{3}}) \in \text{dom}(\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]})$.

Proof. If $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is not pumpable then either Q is a path assembly or Q is not a path assembly. If Q is a path assembly, since $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is not pumpable then there exists a conflict between Q and $\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$. In this case, the lemma is true. Otherwise if Q is not a path assembly, for the sake of contradiction suppose that $Q_{\mathbf{3}} \notin \text{dom}(\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]})$. Then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{4} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{3}}) = \text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}})$ and $\text{type}(Q_{\mathbf{3}}) \neq \text{type}(Q_{\mathbf{4}})$. Let $\ell = |P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}| - 1$ and $\overrightarrow{v}$ be the direction of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$. If $\ell < \mathbf{4}$ then by fact 2.6, we have $Q_{\mathbf{3}-\ell} = Q_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and $Q_{\mathbf{4}-\ell} = Q_{\mathbf{4}} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then there exists a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{3}-\ell}$ and $Q_{\mathbf{4}-\ell}$ which contradicts the definition of $\mathbf{3}$. If $\mathbf{4} \leq \ell$ then by fact 2.6 and by definition of Q, there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} = Q_{\mathbf{4}} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Now, if $\ell < \mathbf{3}$ then $Q_{\mathbf{3}-\ell} = Q_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and there exists a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{3}-\ell}$ and $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ which contradicts the definition of $\mathbf{3}$. Finally if $\mathbf{3} \leq \ell$ then by fact 2.6 and by definition of Q, there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{6} \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{6}} = Q_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Thus there is a conflict between $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{6}}$ and P is not a path assembly which is a contradiction. All cases lead to a contradiction and the lemma is true. □

Note that, if we consider a good candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of a path assembly P then its first collision cannot occurs in $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]})$.

Corollary 2.13. *Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a good segment of P which is not pumpable. Let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ be the first conflict of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$, then* $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{3}}) \in \text{dom}(\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{1}-1]})$.

3 Roadmap

The proof of the main result is long, difficult and requires a lot of transitional lemmas. These lemmas are gathered into different parts as shown in Figure 1 (these dependencies do not introduce a cycle). Note that, all results of this paper can be categorized in two categories:

microscopic and macroscopic ones. Microscopic results focus on a local part of an assembly. A simple typical example is "a segment of $|T|+1$ tiles of an assembly contains at least two identical tiles". On the one hand, these results requires no prerequisites but on the other hand, they deal with very specific conditions (*i.e.* a long list of hypothesis), they are not very useful alone and their proofs are technical and could lead to an explosion of cases to study if not done carefully. Thus microscopic reasoning is lengthy, tedious, technical and not intuitive. Macroscopic results zoom out and focus on the whole assembly. A typical macroscopic results is formulated as "an assembly growing at distance d of the seed should respect property $\mathcal{P}$", the main result of this article is a macroscopic one. Macroscopic results are powerful and intuitive. Their only weakness is that their proofs rely on lengthy microscopic reasoning and thus their proofs are extremely complex.

Thus, the main difficulty is to get through microscopic reasonings to reach macroscopic ones. To achieve this aim, we develop a toolbox made of four macroscopic lemmas. The combination of these lemmas leads to the final result. To present all of our results we divide the rest of the article in five main sections. In section 4, we present the four lemmas of our macroscopic toolbox and we show that this toolbox is enough to solve the conjecture. This approach is more pedagogical, the reader starts with the easiest part of the proof and the aim of the following sections have become clear. Section 5 is dedicated to a $2D$ discrete toolbox. Here we present results some tools and results which are fundamental to all microscopic reasonings. It aims to develop an effective way to cut the grid into different zones. In section 6, we prove one lemma of our macroscopic toolbox whose proof is independent from the other ones (see jail lemma in Figure 1). In the following section 7, we develop a powerful tool about U-turn, this part is the longest and hardest of the proof and a prerequisite for all the remaining macroscopic lemma. In the last section 8, we conclude by proving the three remaining macroscopic lemmas. Their proofs are consecutive: the reset lemma is required for the stakes lemma and the seed lemma is required for the reset lemma (see Figure 1). With this approach, the difficulty increases along the article. Also, this presentation allow us to introduce the different tools one by one and to illustrate them in "simple" cases before moving to the hardest ones.

4 Macroscopic reasoning

This section deals with all the macroscopic reasoning part of the proof. We start by giving conventions and definitions which are necessary to this part. Then, we describe our macroscopic toolbox developed in sections 6 and 8. The conclusion of the proof contains the last step of figure 1. All the figures of this section are in appendix C.

4.1 Conventions and macroscopic tools

First, in this section we will introduce several bounds ($\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{B}^\sigma$, $\mathcal{B}^s$, $\mathcal{B}^e$, $\mathcal{B}^f$) and two functions f^r and f^j, these bounds and functions will depend on the size of the seed ($|\sigma|$) and the size of the tiles set ($|T|$). Their exact values are not trivial to compute and not very useful since they quickly get over exponential. We are more interested into their existence. To avoid lengthy definitions, the exact values of these bounds and functions are all regrouped in appendix A. Conventions introduced here are summarized in figure 14.



Figure 1: The dependencies between the different parts of the proof.

Conventions. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, we would like to work only with positive coordinates. This could easily be achieved by choosing the convention that the southernmost (resp. westernmost) tile of the seed or P has an ordinate (resp. abscissa) of 0. Unfortunately, one of our macroscopic lemma (lemma 4.12) requires to construct a path assembly which goes below the southernmost tile of the seed and P by a distance of at most $\mathcal{B}$ (see appendix A for the exact value of $\mathcal{B}$). In order to keep this new path assembly in the first quadrant of the plane, we will use the following convention.

Convention 4.1. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, we say that P satisfies the *first quadrant convention* if $\min(y_P, y_\sigma) = \mathcal{B}$ and $\min(x_P, x_\sigma) = \mathcal{B}$.

The statements of the different lemmas will always consider a path assembly P which satisfies this convention along this section. Nevertheless, we may construct other path assemblies which does not satisfy this convention along their proofs. Also if a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ does not satisfied the first quadrant convention, then there exists a vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $P + \overrightarrow{v}$ is producible by $(\mathcal{T} + \overrightarrow{v}) = (T, \sigma + \overrightarrow{v}, 1)$, $P + \overrightarrow{v}$ satisfies the first quadrant convention and $P + \overrightarrow{v}$ is pumpable or fragile if and only if P is pumpable or fragile. The second convention deals with the position of the seed. We want the seed to be near the origin.

Convention 4.2. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, we say that P satisfies the *axis conventions* if $y_\sigma - y_P \leq Y_P - Y_\sigma$ and $x_\sigma - x_P \leq X_P - X_\sigma$.

Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, then if P does not satisfy the axis conventions then it is possible to find another path assembly P' producible by another tiling system $\mathcal{T}' = (T, \sigma', 1)$ with $|T'| = |T|$, $|\sigma'| = |\sigma|$ and such that P' satisfies the axis conventions and P is pumpable or fragile if and only if P' is pumpable or fragile. This result is achieved by a symmetry of the x axis or/and of the y axis. For the tile set, this operation is equivalent to switch the north and south glues of each tile (or west and east glues).

Squares. The following definition is dedicated to squares which are an useful tool to delimit a part of the grid graph. A square with sides of length ℓ is the subset of the grid graph G containing vertices of the first quadrant at distance less than ℓ of the origin.

Definition 4.3. Consider $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ defined by $\mathcal{R}(\ell) = \{(x, y) : 0 \leq x \leq \ell \text{ and } 0 \leq y \leq \ell\}$.

Squares will come handy to classify the different parts of the path assembly according to their distance to the origin of the plan. Note that squares are $2D$ objects defined by only one parameter: the length of their sides. This is the main reason why the macroscopic part of the proof is easier than the microscopic one. We will show that the more a path assembly grows away from the origin the more it is constrained. This allows us to consider only one parameter instead of the two dimensions.

Along the article, we will need to describe precisely some patterns of the path assembly. In this model, describing a pattern is unfortunately rather complex. Proofs will rely on mathematical descriptions which are precise but not intuitive. Nevertheless during preliminary presentations of our results we will use a more intuitive but informal language. For example, "the path assembly P reaches an ordinate of L and then enters square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$" means that there exist

two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} > L$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)$. For another example, consider a path assembly P and a square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ such that $\text{pos}(P_1) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ then "the first time the path assembly P leaves the square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ is by its east side" means that $X_P > \ell$ and $\mathbf{1} = \min\{j : j \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell)\}$ is such that $x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} = \ell + 1$. Finally, consider a position $A \in V(G)$, "P ends in A" means that $\text{pos}(P_{|P|}) = A$.

Path assembly with macroscopic initial conditions. Path assemblies that we will study in this section will have six constraints. We start by showing that these constraints are not restrictive. We say that a path assembly which satisfies these properties, satisfies *macroscopic initial conditions* (see appendix A for the value of $\mathcal{B}^f$):

Definition 4.4. Consider a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, the path assembly P satisfies macroscopic initial conditions if:

- P is finite;
- $\text{dom}(P) \cap \text{dom}(\sigma) = \text{pos}(P_1)$;
- $y_{(P_{|P|})} > \mathcal{B}^f$;
- P is simple.
- P satisfies the first quadrant convention and the axis convention.

Note that the third item implies that $\text{pos}(P_{|P|}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^f)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ such that the distance from P to the seed is strictly greater than $\mathcal{B}^f$ then there exists a path assembly P' producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T}' = (T', \sigma', 1)$ with $|T'| = |T|$, $|\sigma'| = |\sigma|$ and such that P' satisfies macroscopic initial conditions and such that if P' is pumpable or fragile then P is pumpable or fragile.*

Proof. In a first time, we will focus on the four first properties, we will deal with the two conventions at the end. By hypothesis there exists an index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that the distance between $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}})$ and the seed is at least $\mathcal{B}^f + 1$. Moreover, since P is producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ then there exists an index $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$. Suppose that $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ (the other case is symmetric and simpler), see Figure 15a for graphical representation of the following notations, then let $\mathbf{3} = \min_{\mathbf{1} \leq i \leq \mathbf{2}}\{i : \text{pos}(P_i) \in \text{dom}(\sigma)\}$ and $\mathbf{4} = \max_{\mathbf{1} \leq i \leq \mathbf{3}}\{i : \text{pos}(P_i)$ is at distance $\mathcal{B}^f + 1$ of the seed$\}$. Now, let P' be the path assembly such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \mathbf{4} - \mathbf{3} + 1$, we have $P'_i = P_{\mathbf{4}-i+1}$ (P' is obtained by switching the indexing of the segment $P_{[\mathbf{4},\mathbf{3}]}$, see Figure 15b). Now, if P' is not simple then there exist two indices $1 < \mathbf{5} < \mathbf{6} < |P'|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} = P_{\mathbf{6}}$ then let $P'' = P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]} \cdot P_{[\mathbf{6},|P'|]}$ (see Figure 16a). W. l. o.g, we suppose that the path assembly P'' is simple (other cycles could be removed the same way). Then $\alpha_{P''} \sqsubseteq \alpha_P$, and $\text{dom}(P'') \cap \text{dom}(\sigma) = \text{pos}(P'_1)$ and then P'' is producible by $\mathcal{T}$. This means that if P'' is pumpable or fragile then P is pumpable or fragile. Moreover P'' is finite ($|P''| \leq |P'| \leq \mathbf{4} - \mathbf{3} + 1$), simple and $P''_{|P''|}$ is the only tile of P'' which is at distance more than $\mathcal{B}^f + 1$ of the seed.

Now, up to some symmetries and a translation, there exists a path assembly Q producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T}' = (T', \sigma', 1)$ with $|T'| = |T|$, $|\sigma'| = |\sigma|$ and such that Q satisfies both conventions and Q is pumpable or fragile if and only if P'' is fragile or pumpable (see Figure 16b). The symmetries and translation do not modify the previous properties of P''. The path

assembly Q is finite, simple and such that $\text{dom}(Q) \cap \text{dom}(\sigma') = \text{pos}(Q_1)$. Moreover the last tile of Q is the only one at distance $\mathcal{B}^f$ of the seed. This means that either $|y_{Q_{|Q|}} - Y_\sigma| > \mathcal{B}^f$ or $|x_{Q_{|Q|}} - X_\sigma| > \mathcal{B}^f$. If $|x_{Q_{|Q|}} - X_\sigma| > \mathcal{B}^f$ then by a symmetry of axis $x = y$ (we switch the x and y axis) we obtain that $|y_{Q_{|Q|}} - Y_\sigma| > \mathcal{B}^f$. This symmetry does not change the previous properties. Then we have a path Q such that $|y_{Q_{|Q|}} - Y_\sigma| > \mathcal{B}^f$. Since Q satisfies the axis convention and $Q_{|Q|}$ is the only tile of Q at distance $\mathcal{B}^f + 1$ of seed, we have $y_{Q_{|Q|}} > Y_\sigma + \mathcal{B}^f$. The path assembly Q with the tiling system $\mathcal{T}'$ satisfies the required properties. □

This result allows us to restrict our study to path assemblies satisfying macroscopic initial conditions. Our final aim goal is to show that such path assemblies are pumpable or fragile. This result will imply that all assemblies growing at distance more than $\mathcal{B}^f$ of the seed are pumpable or fragile.

4.2 The macroscopic toolbox

The key idea of our proof is that the more a path assembly grows away from the seed, the more constraints appear. If one of them is not fulfilled by the path assembly then it is fragile or pumpable. Eventually, all the constraints could not be all fulfilled at the same time and this will conclude the main proof. In this subsection, we present the four main constraints and lemmas of our macroscopic toolbox. Constraints 4.6, 4.10 and 4.13 are the main constraints which have to be fulfilled while constraint 4.8 is a useful tool to allow independent studies of the constraints. Note that these constraints admit several interpretations, their formulations use square but during their introductions we will discuss about more intuitive interpretations. The first two lemmas are illustrated in Figure 17 while Figure 18 is dedicated to the last two ones.

The first macroscopic constraint shows that a path assembly has to choose between growing north or south (resp. west or east) of the seed. More formally, consider a tile assembly system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ then for any path assembly P, if $y_\sigma - y_P > 4|T| + \sigma$ and $Y_P - Y_\sigma > 4|T| - \sigma$ then P is fragile or pumpable. With the chosen conventions, it means that if the seed is at distance more than $\mathcal{B}^\sigma$ from the origin of the plane then it is pumpable or fragile. In terms of squares, this result is stated as follow. For the definition of bound $\mathcal{B}^\sigma$ used in the following definition, see appendix A.

Definition 4.6 (Seed constraint)**.** Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions, P satisfies the *seed constraint* if and only if $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma)$.

Lemma 4.7 (Macro 1: seed lemma)**.** *Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions, if P does not satisfies the seed constraint then it is fragile or pumpable.*

This lemma allows us to consider that the path assembly starts near the origin of the plane, up to constant $\mathcal{B}^\sigma$ which will quickly become negligible compared to the following ones. Also, this result shows the convenience of the chosen conventions and the rectangle notation: consider $\ell \geq \mathcal{B}^\sigma$, then the square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ contains the seed (otherwise the path assembly is fragile or pumpable by lemma 4.7) and if a tile of a path assembly does not belong to the square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ then it is at least at a distance $\ell - \mathcal{B}^\sigma$ of the seed.

Now comes the second macroscopic constraint which shows that the further a path assembly grows away from the origin, the further it has to stay away from it. This constraint is very

useful to show that the path assembly has to avoid artifacts created near the origin of the plane. After stating this lemma, we illustrate how to use it with a quick example. For the definition of function $f^r : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ used in the following definition, see appendix A.

Definition 4.8 (Reset constraint)**.** Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, then P does not satisfy the *reset constraint* for $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ if and only if there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^r(\ell))$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)$.

Lemma 4.9 (Macro 2: reset lemma)**.** *Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\ell > \mathcal{B}^\sigma$. If P does not satisfy the reset constraint for square $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ then P is fragile or pumpable.*

The reset lemma could be interpreted as follow: if the path assembly reaches a distance more than $f^r(\ell)$ of the origin then it must stay away from the origin by at least a distance ℓ. Figure 17 illustrates a quick example of how to use the first two macro lemmas: consider a path assembly P satisfying macroscopic initial conditions and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by the seed constraint, either the path assembly P is fragile or pumpable or the seed σ belongs to the square $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma)$ and thus any tiles outside of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma + d)$ is at distance d of σ. Let $D = f^r(\mathcal{B}^\sigma + d)$. By the reset lemma after exiting the square $\mathcal{R}(D)$, the path assembly P has to stay away from the seed by at least a distance d or it is fragile or pumpable.

The third constraint is the key to the final result. When a path assembly P grows far away from the seed, it is possible to shift its end by a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 18). More precisely, there exists an index $1 \leq s \leq |P|$ such that it is possible to build two other assemblies where $P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (resp. $P_{[s,|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v}$) appears in the first (resp. second) one. For the definition of the bounds $\mathcal{B}^s$ and $\mathcal{B}^f$ used in the following definition, see appendix A. A graphical representation of this lemma is available, see Figure 18.

Definition 4.10 (Stakes constraint I)**.** Let P be a simple path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions. Consider an index $1 \leq s \leq |P|$, a vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and two path assemblies $\mathcal{S}^-$ and $\mathcal{S}^+$ producible by $\mathcal{T}$. The path assembly P satisfies the *stakes constraint* at index s of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ with path assemblies $\mathcal{S}^-$ and $\mathcal{S}^+$ if and only if :

- $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$;
- $\mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ and $\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v})$ are path assemblies producible by $\mathcal{T}$;
- $\sigma, \mathcal{S}^+, \mathcal{S}^-$ and $P_{[1,s]}$ belong to $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$.

The square $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$ is called the *stakes zone* and $\mathcal{S}^-$, $\mathcal{S}^+$ are called stakes.

Definition 4.11 (Stakes constraint II)**.** Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions, P satisfies the stakes constraint if there exists s, $\overrightarrow{v}$, $\mathcal{S}^-$ and $\mathcal{S}^+$ such that P satisfies the stake constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s with path assemblies $\mathcal{S}^-$ and $\mathcal{S}^+$.

Lemma 4.12 (Macro 3: stakes lemma)**.** *Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions. If P does not satisfy the stake constraint then it is fragile or pumpable.*

Note that the proof of the stakes lemma requires lot of microscopic reasoning and is the last and most technical part of the article. Also note that the seed constraint 4.7 seems to be a sub-case of the stakes constraint. Nevertheless, the seed constraint 4.7 is still useful because it is needed to prove the stakes lemma and the bound $(\mathcal{B}^\sigma - \mathcal{B})$ is the only linear bound in our result. Additionally, since path assemblies satisfying macroscopic initial conditions also satisfy the first quadrant convention, the translations of P by $\overrightarrow{v}$ and $-\overrightarrow{v}$ also belong to the first quadrant of the plane but they may not satisfy the first quadrant convention. This lemma is the reason why the border $\mathcal{B}$ is needed in the definition of the seed constraint.

Finally, the last macroscopic constraint is more specific but crucial to conclude the proof. After stating the stakes constraint, it is natural to wonder how the end of the path assembly $P_{[s,|P|]}$ interacts with its translations $(P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ and $(P_{[s,|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v})$. Listing all the possible interactions is the aim of the final part of the proof but we partially answer here this question: if $P_{[s,|P|]}$ and $(P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ does not intersect for a long time then P is fragile or pumpable. For the definition of function $f^j : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ used in the following definition, see appendix A.

Definition 4.13 (Macro 4: jail constraint)**.** Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions. Consider an index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and a vector $\overrightarrow{v}$. The path assembly P is jailed at index $\mathbf{1}$ according to $\overrightarrow{v}$ if and only if there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and an index $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that:

- $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$, $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ and $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^j(\ell))$;
- $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$;
- $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and $(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ does not intersect.

Lemma 4.14 (Macro 4: jail lemma)**.** *Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$. If the path assembly P is jailed at index $\mathbf{1}$ then it is fragile or pumpable.*

Now in the next section, we show that the combination of these four macroscopic results is enough to solve the conjecture.

4.3 Macroscopic reasoning

Here is a quick roadmap of the end of the proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ which respects the stakes constraint at index s of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ then how does $P_{[s,|P|]}$ and $P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ interacts? We give a list of seven possibilities and for each of them, we show that they imply directly the fragility or pumpability of the path assembly. To conclude, we show that $P_{[s,|P|]}$ and $P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ have to match at least one of these seven cases.

Since we need to consider the different intersections between $P_{[s,|P|]}$ and $P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$, we need an efficient tool to find them. We will introduce the following notation $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ which for index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ returns the position of the next intersection between $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. The notion of the "next" intersection implies some subtleties. We are interesting in growing $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in parallel and stop when the first intersection occurs. This definition is not equivalent to the first time that $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ intersects with $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 19).

Definition 4.15. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint at index s according to vector $\overrightarrow{v}$. For any index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, we define $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ as follow, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1}) = |P|$ if $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ does not intersect otherwise $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1}) = \min_{\mathbf{1} \leq i \leq |P|}\{i : \text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},i]}) \cap \text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},i]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \neq \emptyset\}$.

Note that the function $\mathcal{H}$ should also take as argument P and $\overrightarrow{v}$ but there will have no ambiguities along the article so to reduce the amount of notation, we will write only $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$. Also note that, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1}) > \mathbf{1}$ since $\overrightarrow{v}$ is a non null vector. Now, consider the index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, we define a list of seven cases that can be fulfilled by index $\mathbf{1}$. At the end of the section, we conclude that index $\mathbf{1}$ has to match at least one of these cases. Sometimes, several cases can be true for the same index.

The first final case occurs when the end of the path assembly does not intersect with its translation. The fourth macroscopic lemma (jailed path assembly) was designed to deal with this case. For the value $\mathcal{B}^e$ used in the following lemma, see appendix A.

Definition 4.16 (Final case 1: Jail)**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. For any index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, the index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *jail* final case if $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ does not intersect.

Lemma 4.17. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. If there exists an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the* jail *hunt case and such that $\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e + 1)$ then path assembly P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. By the definition of stakes constraint (definition 4.13), we have $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$. Since P satisfies the macroscopic initial conditions, it does not fit in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^f)$ and $\mathcal{B}^f = f^j(\mathcal{B}^e+1)+1$ (see appendix A). Then there exists an index $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^j(\mathcal{B}^e + 1))$. Thus, the path assembly P is jailed at index $\mathbf{1}$ of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and by the jail lemma (lemma 4.14), P is fragile or pumpable. □

The second final case occurs when the end of the path assembly is in conflict with its translation. By the definition of the stakes constraint, the fragility of the path assembly is direct.

Definition 4.18 (Final case 2: Conflict)**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. For any index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *conflict* final case if $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ are in conflict.

Lemma 4.19. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. If there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the* conflict *hunt case then path assembly P is fragile.*

Proof. By the definition of stakes constraint (definition 4.13), the path assembly $P' = \mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[s,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$. Then, since P and P' are in conflict and producible by $\mathcal{T}$, they are both fragile. □

If the end of the path assembly intersects with its translation and if the first intersection is an agreement, then we will show that it is possible to find a good candidate segment in $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$. The third final case occurs when this good candidate segment is pumpable which directly implies the pumpability or fragility of P.

Definition 4.20 (Final case 3: Pumpable)**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. For any index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *pumpable* final case if there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})]}$ is a good pumpable candidate segment.

Fact 4.21. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint at index s according to vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ (then $\overrightarrow{v} \neq \overrightarrow{0}$). If there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the *pumpable* final case then path assembly P is pumpable or fragile.

As the previous case, the intersection between the end of the path assembly and its translation creates a good segment in $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$. The fourth final case occurs when this good segment is of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and conflicts with P after index s (see Figure 20a). Using $\mathcal{S}^+$, we will be able to prove the fragility of P (see Figure 20b). As a side note, this case is the reason why the condition "$\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$" is required in the stakes condition.

Definition 4.22 (Final case 4: Conflict after stake)**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. Consider an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$. The index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Conflict after stake* final case if there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = \overrightarrow{v}$ and the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good segment which is not pumpable. Moreover, let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$, then the first conflict $\mathbf{4}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ should also occurs in $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}-1]})$ (*i.e.* $\mathrm{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \mathrm{dom}(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}-1]})$) and should not enter the stakes zone (*i.e.* $\mathrm{dom}(Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) = \emptyset$).

Lemma 4.23. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. If there exists an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the* Conflict after stake *final case then path assembly P is fragile.*

Proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s with path assembly $\mathcal{S}^+$. Suppose that there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the *Conflict after stake* final case. Then, let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ and let $s \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good candidate segment with $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = \overrightarrow{v}$. By the definition of the stakes constraint, $\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and this path assembly ends at position $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}} + \overrightarrow{v}) = \mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}})$. Now, let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ and let $\mathbf{4}$ be the first conflict of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ in P. Since $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good candidate segment then Q is a path assembly by lemma 2.2. Since index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Conflict after stake* final case then $\mathrm{dom}(Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) = \emptyset$ and by definition of the stakes constraint, $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma \cup \mathcal{S}^+) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$ then $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ and $\sigma \cup \mathcal{S}^+$ cannot intersect. If there exists a conflict between $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ then let $1 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{4}$ be the index such that this conflict occurs in $Q_{\mathbf{5}}$. By the periodicity of Q (fact 2.6) then $Q_{\mathbf{5}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ either belongs to Q or to $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$. If $Q_{\mathbf{5}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ belongs to $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ since there is a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ then there is a conflict between $(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}) - \overrightarrow{v} = P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ which is a contradiction. Otherwise if $Q_{\mathbf{5}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ belongs to Q then by the periodicity of Q

(fact 2.6), there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{6} < \mathbf{5}$ such that $Q_{\mathbf{6}} = Q_{\mathbf{5}} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then, since there is a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$, there exists a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{6}}$ and $(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}) - \overrightarrow{v} = P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]}$ which would contradict the definition of index **4**. Thus, there is no conflict between $(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v})$ and $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$. To conclude, the path assembly $\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}) \cdot Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$. By definition of Q and **4**, P has a conflict with $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ at position $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}})$. All these results lead to the fragility of P. □

The fifth final case is similar to the previous one except that the good candidate segment is of direction $-\overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 21a). This time using $\mathcal{S}^-$, we will be able to prove the fragility of P in a similar way of the previous lemma (see Figure 21b).

Definition 4.24 (Final case 5: Conflict after stake (reverse))**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. Consider an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$. The index **1** matches the *Conflict after stake (reverse)* final case if there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = -\overrightarrow{v}$ and the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good candidate segment which is not pumpable. Moreover, let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$, then the first conflict **4** of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ should also occurs in $\text{dom}(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}-1]})$ (*i.e.* $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \text{dom}(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}-1]})$) and should not enter the stakes zone (*i.e.* $\text{dom}(Q_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) = \emptyset$).

Lemma 4.25. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint at index s according to vector $\overrightarrow{v}$. If there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the* Conflict after stake (reverse) *final case then path assembly P is fragile.*

Proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s with path assembly $\mathcal{S}^-$. Suppose that there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the *Conflict after stake (reverse)* final case. Then, let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ and let $s \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good candidate segment with $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = -\overrightarrow{v}$. By the definition of the stakes constraint, $\mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and this path assembly ends at position $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}} - \overrightarrow{v}) = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}})$. Otherwise, let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ and let **4** be the first conflict of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ in P. Since $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good candidate segment then Q is a path assembly by lemma 2.2. Since index **1** matches the *Conflict after stake (reverse)* final case then $\text{dom}(Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) = \emptyset$ and by definition of the stakes constraint, $\text{dom}(\sigma \cup \mathcal{S}^-) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$ then $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ and $\sigma \cup \mathcal{S}^-$ cannot intersect. If there exists a conflict between $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then let $1 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{4}$ be the index such that this conflict occurs in $Q_{\mathbf{5}}$. By the periodicity of Q (fact 2.6) then $Q_{\mathbf{5}} + \overrightarrow{v}$ either belongs to Q or to $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$. If $Q_{\mathbf{5}} + \overrightarrow{v}$ belongs to $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ since there is a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then there is a conflict between $(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}) + \overrightarrow{v} = P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ which is a contradiction. Otherwise if $Q_{\mathbf{5}} + \overrightarrow{v}$ belongs to Q then by the periodicity of Q (fact 2.6), there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{6} < \mathbf{5}$ such that $Q_{\mathbf{6}} = Q_{\mathbf{5}} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Then, since there is a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$, there exists a conflict between $Q_{\mathbf{6}}$ and $(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}) + \overrightarrow{v} = P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]}$ which would contradict the definition of index **4**. Thus, there is no conflict between $(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ and $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$. Also, since Q is a good candidate segment there is no conflict between $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ and $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$. To conclude, the path assembly $\mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cdot Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$. By definition of Q and **4**, P has a conflict with $Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ at position $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}})$. All these results lead to the fragility of P.

□

The sixth final case occurs if the good candidate segment is of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and its pumping enters the stakes zone. This time using the reset lemma, we will be able to prove the fragility or pumpability of P. Note that the bound $\mathcal{B}^e$ used in the following lemma is defined in appendix A.

Definition 4.26 (Final case 6: Pumping enters stake zone)**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. Consider an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$. The index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Pumping enters stake zone* final case if there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = \overrightarrow{v}$ and the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good candidate segment whose pumping intersects the stakes zone, *i.e.* $\mathrm{dom}(P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 4.27. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and stakes constraint at index s. If there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the* Pumping enters stakes zone *final case and such that* $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \not\subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e)$ *then path assembly P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. See Figure 22 for an illustration of this proof. By definition of the *Pumping enters stake zone* final case, let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ and let $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = \overrightarrow{v}$. Moreover, let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ and then, there exists $(a, b) \in V(G)$ such $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$ and $(a, b) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q)$. By the periodicity of Q (fact 2.6), there exists $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq \mathbf{3}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{4}}) + \ell\overrightarrow{v} = (a, b)$. By definition of the stakes constraint (definition 4.10), we have $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and by the first quadrant convention (convention 4.1), we have $y_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} \geq 0$. Since $y_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} = b - \ell y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$, we have $b = y_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} + \ell y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ and it follows that $\ell \leq b$. Moreover, since $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$, we $b \leq \mathcal{B}^s$ and then $\ell \leq \mathcal{B}^s$. Now, since $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$, we have $a \leq \mathcal{B}^s$ and $x_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} = a - \ell x_{\overrightarrow{v}} \leq a + \ell||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq a + \mathcal{B}^s||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}^s(||\overrightarrow{v}|| + 1) \leq \mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B} + 1)$. Finally, $y_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} = b - \ell y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \leq b \leq \mathcal{B}^s \leq \mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B} + 1)$ and then $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{4}})$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B} + 1))$. By hypothesis, $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \not\subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e)$ then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{1}$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{5}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e)$. Since $f^r(\mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B} + 1)) \leq \mathcal{B}^e$ (see appendix A), it follows that P does not satisfy the reset constraint for $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B} + 1))$ and thus by the reset lemma (lemma 4.9), P is fragile or pumpable. □

The seventh final case occurs if the good segment is of direction $-\overrightarrow{v}$ and its pumping enters the stakes zone. This is the only case where reverse pumping is necessary.

Definition 4.28 (Final case 7: Pumping enters stake zone (reverse))**.** Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s. Consider an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$. The index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Pumping enters stake zone* final case if there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = -\overrightarrow{v}$ and the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good segment whose pumping intersects the stakes zone, *i.e.* $\mathrm{dom}(P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 4.29. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and stakes constraint at index s. If there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the* Pumping enters stakes zone (reverse) *final case and such that* $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e)$ *then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and stakes constraint of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at index s with path assembly $\mathcal{S}^+$. If there exists $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ which matches the *Pumping enters stakes zone (reverse)* final case and such that

$\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e)$. Then let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ and $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a good segment and $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = -\overrightarrow{v}$. Let $Q = P^{*-\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ and if $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]} \cdot Q$ is path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is pumpable (we use reverse pumping in this case). Otherwise if $\text{dom}(Q) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$ is not empty then by a reasoning similar to the one of lemma 4.27, we can show that P does not satisfy the reset constraint for $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B}+1))$ and thus by the reset lemma (lemma 4.9), P is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise, let $\mathbf{4}$ be the first index such that $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]} \cdot Q_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is not a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and let $\ell = |P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}| = \mathbf{3} - \mathbf{2} + 1$. If $\mathbf{4} \leq \ell$ then P conflicts with $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ and then P is fragile by the stakes lemma 4.12 (see Figure 24). Otherwise, by a reasoning similar to lemma 4.23, $Q_{[\ell,\mathbf{4}]}$ and $P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ have no conflict and then $\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}) \cdot Q_{[\ell,\mathbf{4}]}$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and P is fragile.

□

To conclude this section, we show that for any $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ at least one of these seven cases cases is matched.

Lemma 4.30. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint at index s and an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$. Then, index $\mathbf{1}$ has to match at least one of the seven final cases.*

Proof. Figure 24 illustrates the reasoning made along this proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint at index s according to vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ and an index $s \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$. First if $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ does not intersect then index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *jail* final case. Otherwise if $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect then either this intersection is a conflict (index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *conflict* final case) or there is an agreement between $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. If this intersection is an agreement let $\mathbf{3} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1})$ and by definition of $\mathbf{3}$, two cases can occurs either $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}) \in \text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}]})$ or $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \in \text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}]} - \overrightarrow{v})$. In the first (resp. second) case, there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{2}} = P_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{2}} - \overrightarrow{v} = P_{\mathbf{3}}$) and then the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a candidate segment and $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = \overrightarrow{v}$ (resp. $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = -\overrightarrow{v}$). Moreover, since $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect only at position $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}})$ (resp. $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}})$) and since $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$ then the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is also a good segment of P. Consider the case $\overrightarrow{P_{\mathbf{2}}P_{\mathbf{3}}} = \overrightarrow{v}$ (the other case is symmetric) then if the good segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is pumpable then index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *pumpable* final case. Otherwise, let $Q = P^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ and let $\mathbf{4}$ be the first conflict of the good segment $P_{[2,3]}$ of P. By lemma 2.2, we have $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \text{dom}(\sigma \cup P_{[1,\mathbf{2}-1]})$. We consider the different cases:

- $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \text{dom}(P_{[s,\mathbf{2}-1]})$, if $\text{dom}(Q) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s) \neq \emptyset$ then index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Pumping enters stakes zone* final case otherwise index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Conflict after stake* final case;
- $\text{pos}(Q_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \text{dom}(\sigma \cup P_{[1,s]})$: by definition of the stakes constraint, $\text{dom}(\sigma \cup P_{[1,s]})$ is a subset of the stakes zone and thus index $\mathbf{1}$ matches the *Pumping enters stakes zone* final case.

□

Then, all the lemmas of this subsection can be summarized in the following corollary.

Corollary 4.31. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint. Then path assembly P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint at index s. Then consider the first index $\mathbf{1}$ such that $s \geq \mathbf{1}$ and $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e)$ ($\mathbf{1}$ exists since $\mathcal{B}^s < \mathcal{B}^e < \mathcal{B}^f$). By lemma 4.30, index $\mathbf{1}$ has to match one of the seven final cases. Remark that $\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^e + 1)$ and whatever final case $\mathbf{1}$ matches we can always conclude that P is always fragile or pumpable by lemmas or facts 4.17, 4.19, 4.21, 4.23, 4.25, 4.27 or 4.29. □

Finally we can state the main theorem and prove it.

Theorem 4.32 (Main theorem)**.** *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if the distance between P and the seed is more than $\mathcal{B}^f$ then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ such that its distance from the seed is strictly more than $\mathcal{B}^f$ then by lemma 4.5, there exists a path assembly P' producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T}' = (T', \sigma', 1)$ (with $|\sigma| = |\sigma'|$, $|T'| = |T|$) such that P' satisfies macroscopic initial conditions and such that if P' is fragile or pumpable then P is fragile or pumpable. By lemma 4.12, if P' does not satisfy the stakes constraint, it is fragile or pumpable. By lemma 4.31, if P' satisfies the stakes constraint then P' is fragile or pumpable. Thus in all cases, P' is fragile or pumpable. □

5 Two dimensional discrete toolbox

Along the proofs, we will need to isolate some specific parts of the $2D$ grid. Achieving this result is far from trivial. Firstly, we start by defining the kind of cut we will use along the articles. This definition is quite general and we list the specific settings which will appear along the article. Secondly, we study how a path interact with our cuts. Thirdly, we introduce the decomposition of a path according to a cut: we divide a path into segments such that each of these segments belongs only to one part of the cut. Although these notions seems intuitive, some special cases require precise definitions. Finally, we end this section by an application of our results to a specific case which will be important later. The figures of this section are in appendix D.

5.1 Definition of a cut of the grid

To disconnect a graph, there exist two classical methods: cuts where a subset of edges are removed and vertex separators where a subset of vertices are removed. In this article, these methods are not efficient because they may cut the grid into more than two parts. Instead, we will use an hybrid approach to cut the $2D$ discrete grid G. We will use a simple path, called a *window*, which is either a bi-infinite path or a cycle to divide the grid into two parts. One part corresponds to the left side of the window; the other one corresponds to the right side (see Figure 25 for an example) of the window. The definition of our cut is done in several steps. A *cut* (G_1, G_2) and its *window* W are three graphs such that:

- $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$ and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G)$;
- G_1 and G_2 are connected graphs;
- $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = V(W)$;

- $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = E(W)$;
- W is either a simple cycle or a simple bi-infinite path;

Intuitively, the union of graphs G_1 and G_2 is the grid graph G. Nevertheless, these two graphs shares some vertices and edges in common. These vertices and edges create a simple path W (bi-infinite or a cycle) which is the window of the cut. The graphs G_1 and G_2 will correspond to the left and right side of the window and thus to the two zones of our cut. Remark that with our definition, there exists no edge with an extremity in $V_1 \setminus V(W)$ and the other one in $V_2 \setminus V(W)$. Thus any path P starting in $V_1 \setminus V(W)$ (resp. $V_2 \setminus V(W)$) and ending in $V_2 \setminus V(W)$ (resp $V_1 \setminus V(W)$) has to intersect with the window W. These intersections between P and W will allow us to decompose P into subpaths, called *arcs*, which belongs exclusively to G_1 or exclusively to G_2. Before this, we still have to deal with one obstacle to define properly our cut. Indeed, the current definition allow us to define $G_1 = G$ and $G_2 = W$ which is not useful for our study. To solve this problem we have to define the right and left side of the window, to achieve this aim we need an indexing of the window W.

We remind that the *indexing* (see section 2.1) of the window W is a representation of this path as a bi-infinite sequence of vertices $(W_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ such that for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, W_i is a vertex of $V(W)$, the edge (W_i, W_{i+1}) belongs to $E(W)$ and $W_{i-1} \neq W_{i+1}$. Moreover, if W is a cycle then for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $W_{i+|V(W)|} = W_i$. Note that for a given window W, an indexing of this window is not unique and depends on two parameters: the *origin* and the *orientation*. Indeed, one position of W has to be chosen as the origin W_0 of the index. If W is a cycle there exists $|W|$ possibilities, otherwise there exists an infinity of possibilities. After choosing an origin W_0, one of the two neighbors of W_0 has to be chosen as W_1, and the other one as W_{-1} (see figure 26). Here, two possibilities arise. Consider a window W and two indexing $(W_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and $(W'_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of W, we say that these two indexing *have the same orientation* if and only if for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $W_i = W'_j$, we have $W_{i+1} = W'_{j+1}$ otherwise they do not have the same orientation. Along the article, the choice of W_0 and of the orientation is either not relevant or specified when necessary.

Now that indexing have been defined, we can analyze the structure of W more precisely. Consider a window W and an indexing of W, then the window W is made of two kinds of vertices: vertex W_i is *straight* if $x_{W_{i-1}} = x_{W_{i+1}}$ or $y_{W_{i-1}} = y_{W_{i+1}}$ otherwise it is a *corner* (see figure 25). Note that being straight or being a corner does not depend on the origin or orientation of the index. Now remark, that any position W_i of $V(W)$ is the extremities of four different edges of $E(G)$. Among these four edges, two of them belongs to $V(W)$ since W is a bi-infinite path or a cycle. Among the two others edges, we impose new constraints: if W_i is a corner then the two other edges both belong to the graph G_j with $j \in \{1, 2\}$, otherwise if W_i is straight then one of the edge belongs to G_1 and the other one belongs to G_2. To finish our definition of a cut of the grid, we need one last more constraint. Consider a vertex $A \in V(G)$ which is a neighbor of W_i and such that the edge (A, W_i) belongs to $E(G) \setminus E(W)$ then if the angle $\widehat{W_{i-1}W_iA} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (resp. $\widehat{W_{i-1}W_iA} = -\frac{\pi}{2}$) then the edge (W_i, A) belongs to G_1 (resp. G_2), we say that that A is in the left side (resp. right side) of W_i. Note that the definition of left and right depends on the orientation of the indexing, switching the orientation will switch the left and right side (see figure 26). Now all constraints of our cut have been specified. We conjecture that that for any window W which is a simple bi-infinite path or a simple cycle there exists a unique couple of graphs (G_1, G_2) such that G_1, G_2, W satisfies all these properties. Hopefully,

we will only consider four kinds of cut where these properties could be achieved "easily". Before defining these cuts we recap the different kind of vertices and edges which will be encountered along the proof (see figure 27).

There exists three kinds of vertices: the ones in $V(W)$ (and thus in both $V(G_1)$ and $V(G_2)$), the ones in $V(G_1) \setminus V(W)$ and the ones in $V(G_2) \setminus V(W)$. Things are more complicated for edges since there exists five kinds of edges (see figure 27):

- the ones where at least one extremity is in $V(G_1) \setminus V(W)$ and which belongs to $E(G_1)$;
- the ones where at least one extremity is in $V(G_2) \setminus V(W)$ and which belongs to $E(G_2)$;
- the ones which belongs of $E(W)$ and thus to both $E(G_1)$ and $E(G_2)$;
- the ones where both extremities are in $V(W)$ and belongs to $E(G_1) \setminus E(W)$;
- the ones where both extremities are in $V(W)$ and belongs to $E(G_2) \setminus E(W)$;

Edges of the fourth and fifth kinds requires that there there exists $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $W_i \notin \{W_{j-1}, W_j, W_{j+1}\}$ and W_i is a neighbors of W_j in G. Finally, consider an edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$ and and index $\mathbf{1}$ such that $u = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ then to determine to which part of the cut of the grid this edge belongs, we only need to know $W_{[\mathbf{1}-1,\mathbf{1}+1]}$. In this case, we say that (u, v) is *strictly on the left side* (res. right side) of $W_{[\mathbf{1}-1,\mathbf{1}+1]}$ if and only if $(u, v) \notin E(W)$ and (u, v) is on the left side of the cut of the grid (resp. right side), see Figure 27. Since this notion relies only on local argument, it could be extended to finite paths.

Cutting the grid with a simple cycle. Consider a simple cycle C then it is always possible to find a cut (G^I, G^E) such that its window is C. Moreover, one of the two graphs is infinite while the other one is finite, see Figure 28. We will consider that G^I, called the *interior* of C, is the finite one and G^E, called the *exterior* of C, is the infinite one. This result is due to Jordan curve theorem. This theorem requires a planar embedding of the grid graph, as well as "non-integer half-square-tiles". Although our drawings use a planar embedding, our proofs do not. Jordan curve theorem stipulates that any continuous simple cycle of the planar graph cuts $\mathbb{R}$ in two components: a finite one and an infinite one. To apply our result in our setting, we just have to consider the continuous counterpart of our cycle C. A vertex A is in G^I if the point in the continuous grid is inside the finite component of C. Same reasoning is done for edges especially for the ones linking two vertices of the window. For the indexing, its origin and orientation will be specified when required.

Cutting the grid with lines. Now, we define a cut of the grid graph G using discrete lines, which typically live in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Consider a vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and a line of slope $\overrightarrow{v}$, we would like to cut the grid in two parts, one part with vertices which are over the line and the other part with vertices which are under the line. Fortunately, discrete approximation of continuous line with rational slope is a well known topic: in language theory they are represented as Christoffel word (Sturmian words represented discrete approximation of continuous lines with irrational slopes). The following tools are folklore and easy to check. The *height function* of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ is the function $h : V(G) \to \mathbb{Z}$ where the *height* of vertex $(x, y) \in V(G)$ is $h(x, y) = x_{\overrightarrow{v}}y - xy_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. Remark that for any vertex $X \in V(G)$, we have $h(X) = h(X + \overrightarrow{v})$. The *cut of the grid by the line of direction* $\overrightarrow{v}$ *of height* h is the following two infinite graphs U and D (see Figure 29a):

$$\begin{aligned} V(U) &= \{X \in V(G) | h(X) \geq h\} \\ E(U) &= \{(X,Y) \in E(G) | X \in V(U), Y \in V(U)\} \\ V(D) &= \{X \in V(G) | h(X) < h + x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}\} \\ E(D) &= \{(X,Y) \in E(G) | X \in V(D), Y \in V(D)\} \end{aligned}$$

The graph U is called the upper part of the cut and the graph D is the lower part of the cut. The window L is $V(L) = V(U) \cap V(D) = \{X \in \mathbb{Z}^2 | h \geq h(X) > h - x_{\overrightarrow{v}} - y_{\overrightarrow{v}}\}$ and $E(L) = \{(X,Y) \in E(G) | X \in V(W), Y \in V(W) \text{ and } (X,Y) \in E\}$. This window is a simple bi-infinite path which is stable under translation of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$: $L + \overrightarrow{v} = L$. Moreover, the window is made by a periodic pattern of length $p = x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ (see figure 29). This remark allow us to always choose an orientation of the indexing such that for all indices $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $L_{i+p-1} = L_i + \overrightarrow{v}$. Such an indexing is called *coherent* with the direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. With this convention, the zone U is the left side and the zone D is the right side of the cut of the grid. Also, for this kind of cut there exists no edge of the four or fifth kind: if we consider an edge $(u,v) \in E(G)$ such that $u \in V(W)$ and $v \in V(W)$ then $(u,v) \in E(W)$. Along the article, the vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ will always be such that either $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ or $y = 0$ and $x > 0$. Finally, no confusion on the direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ will occur along the article: if different cuts of the grid using discrete lines are considered at the same time in the article, then these lines will all have the same direction but with different heights. The considered height function will be the same for all these cuts of the grid.

Cutting the grid with the extension of a good path. This cut is a generalization of the previous case. Consider a good path P and let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_1 P_{|P|}}$ be its direction. Let $W = P^\omega$. Since P is a good path, then by lemma 2.2 the path W is a simple bi-infinite path. By the periodicity of W (see fact 2.3), there exists an indexing of W such that for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $W_{i+|P|-1} = W_i + \overrightarrow{v}$. Such an indexing of W is *coherent* with P if $W_0 = P_1$. Consider the height function h of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and let $H = \max\{h(A) : A \in P\}$ and $h = \min\{h(A) : A \in P\}$, then for any W_i, we have $H \geq h(W_i) \geq h$. Then, there exists a cut (U,D) of the grid such that W is its window (see Figure 30) and such that the graph U contains all vertices of height greater than H and is the left side of W (if the indexing of W is coherent) while the graph D contains all vertices of height less than h and is the right side of W (if the indexing of W is coherent). Using Jordan's curve theorem, we can determine to which component the vertices and edges of height between h and H belong. This result is possible from the periodicity of W, we only have to consider a finite part of the window to determine if the vertices or the edges belong to U or D. Morever if a position $A \in V(G)$ or an edge $u \in E(G)$ belongs to U (resp. D) then $A + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(U)$ (resp. $A + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(D)$) or $u + \overrightarrow{v} \in E(U)$ (resp. $u + \overrightarrow{v} \in E(D)$). Note that cutting the grid with a line is a special case of cutting the grid with a good path since the discretization of a continuous line of rational slope is obtained from a periodic finite pattern. Nevertheless, we made a distinction between these two kinds of cut because they will be used in different settings along the proof. Moreover, cutting the grid with a line is more intuitive: all properties can be checked by computing the height of vertices.

Cutting the grid with a simple path with visible extremities. Consider a finite simple path P, we say that its extremities P_1 (resp. $P_{|P|}$) is *visible the from west* if and only if there exists no $1 \leq i \leq |P|$ such that $x_{P_i} < x_{P_1}$ (resp. $x_{P_i} < x_{P_{|P|}}$) and $y_{P_i} = y_{P_1}$ (resp. $y_{P_i} = y_{P_{|P|}}$). Intuitively, P does not pass by a position west of its starting (resp. ending) point. Similarly, we define the visibility from the east, north and south (see Figure 31 for an example). The path P has *visible extremities* if and only if P_1 is visible (from the west in our example) and $P_{|P|}$ is visible (from the east in our example) and the ray starting in their extremities does not intersect (in our example there is no position $A \in V(G)$ such that $x_A \leq x_{P_1}$, $y_A = y_{P_1}$, $x_A > x_{P_{|P|}}$ and $y_A = y_{P_{|P|}}$). Such a path could be completed into a bi-infinite path by adding horizontal ray in its ending and starting position (see Figure 31b). More formally, let W be the bi-infinite path such that for all $0 \leq i \leq |P| - 1$, we have $W_i = P_{i+1}$, for all $i < 0$, we have $W_i = W_{i+1} + (-1, 0)$ (if P_1 is visible from the west) and for all $i \geq |P|$, we have $W_i = W_{i-1} + (1, 0)$ (if $P_{|P|}$ is visible from the east). Then the path W is a simple bi-infinite path since both extremities of P are visible. Moreover, there exists a cut of the grid (C^+, C^-) such that W is the window of this cut. This result is a combination of the previous kinds of cut of the grid: $W_{[-\infty,0]}$ and $W_{[|P|-1,+\infty]}$ are infinite lines while $W_{[0,|P|-1]} = P$ is a finite path which belongs to a finite rectangle of size $(X_P - x_P + 2) \times (Y_P - y_P + 2)$. This finite zone could be partitioned using Jordan curve theorem. Note that when we have defined W, we also have defined an indexing of W. We will always consider this indexing of W which is called *coherent* with P. Also this kind of cut could be generalize as previously by extending the extremities of P by any periodic pattern instead of simple lines.

Splitting a cut in two. We have defined the four kinds of cut of the grid that will be used along the article. Afterwards, in the statement or in the proof of a lemma, we will mainly consider only one cut of the grid at a time but sometimes we need to consider two cuts of the grid at the same time. Here lies a subtlety. The aim of a cut of the grid is to divide the grid into two connected components. Thus making two consecutive cuts of the grid should divide the grid into four connected components. The intuitive approach to deal with two cuts of the grid (G_1, G_2) and (G_3, G_4) is to consider the four following graphs: $G_1 \cap G_3$, $G_1 \cap G_4$, $G_2 \cap G_3$ and $G_2 \cap G_4$. Unfortunately, this approach is not correct because in some cases these graphs are not connected (see Figure 32). We now explain how to achieve this goal in a very specific setting which is the one used in section 7.4, see Figure 33.

Consider a finite simple path P with P_1 visible from the west and $P_{|P|}$ visible from the east and consider the cut of grid (C^+, C^-) according to the finite simple path P with visible extremities. Let W be the window of this cut of the grid and consider a coherent indexing of W. Now consider a good path Q such that $Q^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of C^+ and such that there exists an index $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathrm{dom}(Q) \cap V(W) = Q_1 = W_{\mathbf{1}}$. We say that the extension of Q splits C^+ at position $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ into (A^+, A^-) where A^+ and A^- is a cut of the graph C^+, *i.e.* A^+ and A^- are subgraphs of C^+, $A^+ \cup A^- = C^+$, $A^+ \cap A^- = Q^{+\omega}$ and A^+ contains $W_{[\mathbf{1},+\infty]}$ and A^- contains $W_{[-\infty,\mathbf{1}]}$.

5.2 Interactions between a path and a window

Now, that we have an efficient way to decompose the grid in different zones, we analyze how a path interacts with these zones. In this section we consider a cut (G_1, G_2), its window W

and an indexing of this window. Until the end of the section, we will always assume that this window is a bi-infinite path. Now, our final aim is to decompose a path P into a sequence of subpaths such that all these subpaths are either subgraphs of G_1 or subgraphs of G_2. Finding such a decomposition is easy but there exists several of them and to find an interesting one, we have to be careful and precise in our definitions. First, we introduce some definitions to classify different kinds of path according to their interactions with W (see Figure 34).

In this section, we consider a simple finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$. From now on, be careful that we deal with two indexings, the one of the window W and the one of the path P. Let $\mathbf{1} = \min\{i : W_i \in V(P)\}$ and $\mathbf{2} = \max\{i : W_i \in V(P)\}$, then we say that P starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$. Remark that $\mathbf{2} \geq \mathbf{1}$ and the *width* of path P is $w(P) = \mathbf{2} - \mathbf{1} \geq 0$. The *segment of the window associated* to P is $W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$. Note that $V(P) \cap V(W) \subset V(W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]})$. The path P is *extremum* if and only if $\{P_1, P_{|P|}\} = \{W_{\mathbf{1}}, W_{\mathbf{2}}\}$ (we will mainly consider extremum paths in the article). A path P is *basic* if there exists two indices $\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_1$, $W_{\mathbf{4}} = P_{|P|}$ and if $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4}$ then $V(W_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}]}) \cap V(P) = \{W_{\mathbf{3}}, W_{\mathbf{4}}\}$ or $V(W_{[\mathbf{4},\mathbf{3}]}) \cap V(P) = \{W_{\mathbf{3}}, W_{\mathbf{4}}\}$ otherwise. Consider $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then the path P is an *arc* of G_i if and only if P is a subgraph of G_i. Note that the hypothesis $E(P) \subset E(G_i)$ implies that $V(P) \subset V(G_i)$ (and thus that P is a subgraph of G_i) whereas the reciprocity is false, see the path P in Figure 34. Similarly to path, an arc could be basic or extremum. Finally an arc is *elementary* if and only if $V(A) \cap V(W) = \{A_1, A_{|A|}\}$, *i.e.* the arc intersects the window only at its extremities. Being an elementary arc is equivalent to being a basic and extremum path.

Now, consider a path P such that P starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $w(P) > 0$, then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ (resp. $1 \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$) such that $P_{\mathbf{3}} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{4}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$). Since $w(P) > 0$ then $\mathbf{3} \neq \mathbf{4}$. If $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$ then we say that P is a *positive* path otherwise P is *negative*. If P is positive (resp. negative) then $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}]}$ (resp. $P_{[\mathbf{4},\mathbf{3}]}$) is an extremum path and a subgraph of P, this path is called *the extremum path* extracted from P (see Figure 35). Note that we have defined the orientation of path of width at least 1. The definition of the orientation of path of width 0 is postpone to the next subsection.

When paths interact with a window, they delimit different zones of the grid. Firstly, consider a basic path P and $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{1}} = P_1$ and $W_{\mathbf{2}} = P_{|P|}$. We suppose that $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$, the other case is symmetric, then P and $W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ creates a simple cycle C. Now, consider the cut (G^I, G^E) of G defined by C, then the finite graph G^I is called the *restrained interior* of the basic path P (see Figure 36). This graph is not necessarily a subgraph of G_1 or a subgraph of G_2.

Secondly, consider a path P with starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$, let Q be the extremum path extracted from P. Then $W' = W_{[-\infty,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot Q \cdot W_{[\mathbf{2},+\infty]}$ is a simple bi-infinite path which can be used to delimit a cut (G_3, G_4) of the grid. This cut is called the *cut associated* to P and W' is the *window associated* to P (see Figure 37a for a simple example where P is an arc and see Figures 40 and 47 for a more complex example). Moreover, if P is an arc of G_1, if G_1 is the left side of W and if G_3 is the left side of W' then G_3 is a subgraph of G_1 and G_2 is a subgraph of G_4. In this case, we define the *interior* of the extremum arc P as the graph G^I where $V(G^I) = \{A : A \in (V(G_4) \cap V(G_1))\}$ and $E(G^I) = \{(u, v) : u \in V(G^I), v \in V(G^I) \text{ and } (u, v) \in V(G_4)\}$ (see Figure 37b). Note that G^I is always a finite graph and let S be the segment of W associated to P then P and S are both subgraph of G^I. If P is a basic arc then $P \cdot S$ is a simple cycle and G^I is the interior of this cycle. If P is not basic then we cannot define a window for the graph G^I. In every cases, note that the only way to enter in the interior of an extremum arc of G_i is either by intersecting the arc P or by passing by an edge of G_2.

Now, consider fours indices $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}$ and two arcs A and B such that A (resp. B) starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. $W_{\mathbf{3}}$) and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ (resp. $W_{\mathbf{4}}$), if $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{4}$ then B starts in the interior of A and has to leave it, this means that A and B intersect (see Figure 38). This remark is a fundamental property of arc and window:

Fact 5.1. Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its window W, $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and two arcs A and B of G_k such that A (resp. B) starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ (resp. starts in $W_{\mathbf{3}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{4}}$), then if $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{3} < \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{4}$, then A and B intersect, *i.e.* $V(A) \cap V(B) \neq \emptyset$.

First, this fact has some consequences for the cuts of the grid by the extension of a good path (see Figure 39).

Lemma 5.2. *Consider a good path P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and let (U,D) be the cut of the grid by the extension of P. Consider an arc A of U or D of width greater than $|P|$ then A and $A - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect.*

Proof. Let $W = P^\omega$ be the window of this cut of the grid. Without loss of generality, we suppose that A is an arc of U. Let $m \geq |P|$ be the width of A and consider an indexing of W such that A starts in W_0 and ends in W_m. Since we consider a cut of the grid by the extension of a good path of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ then $A - \overrightarrow{v}$ is also an arc of U. Moreover, the arc $A - \overrightarrow{v}$ starts in $W_{-|P|}$ and ends in $W_{m-|P|}$. Since by hypothesis $-|P| < 0 \leq m - |P| < m$, then by fact 5.1 the arcs A and $A - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect. □

Corollary 5.3. *Consider a vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and a cut (U, D) of the grid by a line of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and its window L. Consider an arc A of U or D of width greater than $x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ then A and $A - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect.*

Also, fact 5.1 is important to categorize the different possible interactions between several arcs. Let $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and consider two arcs A and B of G_k such that A (resp. B) starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ (resp. starts in $W_{\mathbf{3}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{4}}$). Then, there exists three kinds of possible interactions between these two arcs:

- if $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4}$ then we say that B is *consective* to A (if $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$ then B is *stricly consecutive* to A).
- if $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq \mathbf{2}$ then either B is a subgraph of the interior of A or A and B intersect. In this case we say that A *dominates* B;
- if $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{3} < \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{4}$ then in this case A intersects with B by fact 5.1.

Remark that if $\mathbf{3} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{4} = \mathbf{2}$ then arc A dominates B and B dominates A but in this case A and B intersect. Thus if A and B does not intersect then only two cases are possible: either one arc dominates the other one or one arc is strictly consecutive to the other one. Moreover if A dominates B and does not intersect with B then B is a subgraph of the interior of A. Also note that the property of being consecutive is transitive: consider three arcs A, B and C, if A is consecutive to B and B is consecutive to C then A is consecutive to C. Sequences of consecutive arcs will play a major role in the rest of the article.

5.3 Decomposition of a path into extremum arcs

The aim of this part is to decompose a path P into a sequence of strictly consecutive arcs. This decomposition will remove all unnecessary information in P and will help studying it: all positions of P which belong to the other zone of the grid are removed and we keep only extremum and dominating arcs. Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its window W and a simple finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ (see Figure 40). The *decomposition of P into extremum arcs* in G_1 is defined in three steps. First consider the finite set of arcs $\mathcal{A}$ of G_1 (see Figure 41a) such that :

- for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, A is an arc of G_1;
- for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $A = P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and if $\mathbf{1} > 1$ (resp. $\mathbf{2} < |P|$) then the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}, P_{\mathbf{1}})$ (resp. $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}}+1)$) does not belongs to G_1;
- for all $1 \leq i \leq |P|$ such that $P_i \in V(G_1)$, there exists $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $P_i \in V(A)$.

Now, we define the finite set of arcs $\mathcal{A}'$ of G_1 by replacing each arc of $\mathcal{A}$ by the extremum arc extracted from it, *i.e.* an arc A' belongs to $\mathcal{A}'$ if and only if there exists an arc A of $\mathcal{A}$ such that A' is the extremum arc extracted from A (see Figure 41b). Finally the decomposition of P into extremum arcs is the sequence $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ such that (see Figure 42):

- for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, there exists $A' \in \mathcal{A}'$ such that $A^i = A'$;
- for all $A' \in \mathcal{A}'$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that $A^i = A'$ if and only if there exists no $A'' \in \mathcal{A}'$ such that A' is dominated by A''.
- for all $1 \leq i < \ell$, the arc A^{i+1} is strictly consecutive to A^i.

Remark that all simple paths admit a unique decomposition in extremum arcs and that all arcs of this decomposition are extremum ones. Moreover since P is simple, for all $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$, the arc A^i does not intersect with the arc A^j. One important property of a decomposition is that it divides the window in several parts (see Figure 43). The *decomposition* of W associated to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is the finite sequence $(S^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ such that S^i is the segment of W associated to the arc A^i. The *dual decomposition* of W according to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is the finite sequence $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ defined as follow:

- for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$, let $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that A^i ends in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and A^{i+1} starts in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ then $D^i = W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$;
- let $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that A^1 starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. A^ℓ ends in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$) then D^0 (resp. D^ℓ) is the infinite path $W_{[-\infty,\mathbf{1}]}$ (resp. $W_{[\mathbf{1},+\infty]}$).

Remark that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, if $|A^i| = 1$ then $|S^i| = 1$ but for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell$, we have $|D^i| > 1$. Also, remark that $W = D^0 \cdot_{1\leq i\leq \ell} (S^i \cup D^i)$.

Now, we study the properties of these definitions. The main aim of this subsection is lemma 5.25 which states that if a positive simple path P is extremum then its decomposition in extremum arcs is positive. To achieve this result, a lengthy sequence of lemmas is required. Their aims is to characterized the different interactions between the different parts of the grid which

are defined by a decomposition. Remark that most of these lemmas will also be used in the next sections and are an important part of our toolbox. Now, we start by proving the main properties of a decomposition into extremum arcs.

Lemma 5.4. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid and its bi-infinite window W. Consider a simple finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P in extremum arcs in G_1, its decomposition $(S^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of W and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of W. Then for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(G^1)$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(G^I)$ where G^I is the interior of A^i, for all $0 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \ell$, $V(D^i) \cap V(P) \subset \{D^i_1, D^i_{|D^i|}\}$ and the edge (D^i_1, D^i_2) is not an edge of $E(P)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}'$ be the two sets used in the construction of the decomposition of P in extremum arcs and consider $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(G^1)$. Then there exists an arc $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(A)$. Then there exists an arc $A' \in \mathcal{A}'$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ belongs to the interior of A'. Now there exists an index $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that either $A^i = A'$ or A^i dominates A'. In both cases $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ belongs to the interior of A^i. Then for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(G_1)$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in G^I$ where G^I is the interior of A^i. Since $W = D^0 \cdot_{1\leq i\leq \ell} (S^i \cup D^i)$, then for all $0 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \ell$, $V(D^i) \cap V(W) \subset \{D^i_1, D^i_{D^i}\}$. Moreover, if there exists $0 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that the edge (D^i_1, D^i_2) is an edge of $E(P)$ then by the previous remark we have $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $|D^i| = 2$ but in this case $A^i \cup D^i \cup A^{i+1}$ is an arc of P which dominates both A^i and A^{i+1} and this is a contradiction. □

Now, we can extend the definition of orientation to dual segments and to arcs of length 1 (see Figure 44). Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and two indices $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = D^i_1$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}} = D^i_{|D^i|}$ then the dual segment D^i is *positive* (resp. *negative*) if and only if $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ (resp. $\mathbf{1} > \mathbf{2}$). For an arc of length 1, we give the following definition.

Definition 5.5. Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that $|A^i| = 1$ and let $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and $\mathbf{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$. If $\mathbf{1} = 1$ (resp. $\mathbf{1} = |P|$) then let $\mathbf{3} = \min\{i > 1 : P_i \in V(W)\}$ (resp. $\mathbf{3} = \max\{i < |P| : P_i \in V(W)\}$) and let $\mathbf{4}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{4}} = P_{\mathbf{3}}$. If $\mathbf{4} > \mathbf{2}$ then A^i is positive (resp. negative) otherwise A^i is negative (resp. positive). Now if $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$, the arc A^i is a negative arc if and only if up to some rotation $W_{\mathbf{2}+1} = W_{\mathbf{2}} + (0, 1)$, $W_{\mathbf{2}-1} = W_{\mathbf{2}} - (1, 0)$, $P_{\mathbf{1}+1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} - (0, 1)$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} + (1, 0)$ otherwise it is positive.

A decomposition implies the existence of many different finite zones of the grid. Each arc A^i defines a different zone of the grid with its interior. Using all these finite zones we define a new cut of the grid by considering the bi-infinite path $W' = D^0 \cdot_{1\leq i\leq \ell} (A^i \cup D^i)$ which is called the *window associated* to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$. Then W' is the window of a cut of the grid (G^3, G^4) such that G^3 is a subgraph of G^1 and G^2 is a subgraph of G^4, see Figure 45. Moreover if G^1 is the left (resp. right) side of W then G^3 is the left (resp. right) side of W'. A corollary of lemma 5.4 is that $(V(G^3) \setminus V(W)) \cap V(P) = \emptyset$: the zone of the grid G^3 does not contains any position of P except in its window.

Corollary 5.6. *Consider a cut (G^1, G^2) of the grid and its window W. Consider a simple finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into*

extremum arcs in G^1. Let W' and (G^3, G^4) be the window and the cut of the grid associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ such that G^3 is a subgraph of G^1, then $(V(P)\cap V(G^3))\setminus V(W') = \emptyset$.

Now, consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$, then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ (resp. $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$) such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = D^i_1$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{2}} = D^i_{|D^i|}$). If $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ (resp. $\mathbf{1} > \mathbf{2}$) then by lemma 5.4, $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ (resp.$P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]}$) is a basic path of W and we can define the *interior* of D^i as the restrained interior of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]}$ (resp. $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]}$), see Figure 46. Remark that the interior of an arc is a subgraph of G_i but the interior of dual is not necessarily a subgraph of G_1 or G_2. Consider the cut (G_5, G_6) associated to P and its windows W'', suppose that G_1 is the left side of W'' and G_5 is the left side of W' then the interior of D^0 and D^ℓ is the graph G_6 (see Figure 47).

To summarize, if P is an extremum path, these three cuts of the grid interact as follow (see Figure 49):

- The zone G_3 is a subgraph of G_1 (intuitively G_3 is obtained by removing the interiors of all arcs A^i from G_1);
- The zone G_3 is a subgraph of G_5 (intuitively G_5 is obtained by adding to G_3 the interiors of all segments D^i).

We are mainly interested in the decomposition of extremum paths but we will prove more general results. We starts by two properties about the decomposition of an extremum path into extremum arcs. These results are useful to show lemma 5.10 which states that the intersection between the interior of two dual segments is a subset of $V(P)$. The first result is that the first and last arcs of a decomposition of an extremum path P into extremum arcs are positive if P is positive (see Figure 49b). In fact, we will later prove that all arcs and dual segments of the decomposition of an extremum path are positive but we need this preliminary result first.

Lemma 5.7. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W and a simple path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P in extremum arcs in G_1. Let $\mathbf{1}$ such that P starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. ends in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$) and suppose that $P_1 = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. $P_{|P|} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$) then A^1 is positive (resp. A^ℓ is positive). Moreover, $P_1 = A^1_1$ (resp. $P_{|P|} = A^\ell_{|A^\ell|}$).*

Proof. Suppose that there exists $\mathbf{1}$ such that P starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_1 = W_{\mathbf{1}}$, the other case is symmetric. If $P_1 \neq A^1_1$ then A^1 starts in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ with $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$ which contradicts the fact that P starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$. Now, if $|A^1| > 1$ then A^1 ends in $W_{\mathbf{3}}$ with $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{1}$ and thus A is positive. Otherwise let $\mathbf{4} = \min\{i > 1 : P_1 \in V(W)\}$ and let $\mathbf{3}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{4}}$ then since P starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$, we have $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{2}$ and thus A^1 is positive. □

Corollary 5.8. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a simple finite extremum path P and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P in extremum arcs in G_1. If P is positive (resp. negative) then A^1 and A^ℓ are both positive (resp. negative). Moreover, $P_1 = A^1_1$ (resp. $P_1 = A^\ell_{|A^\ell|}$) and $P_{|P|} = A^\ell_{A^\ell}$ (resp. $P_{|P|} = A^1_1$).*

Now, consider an extremum path P and a decomposition of this path in the left side of the grid, then all the dual segments belongs to the left side of the cut of the grid associated to P (see Figures 48b and 49d).

Lemma 5.9. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its window W such that G_1 is the left side of W. Consider a simple finite extremum path P and its decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ in extremum arcs in G_1. Consider the dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of W according to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and consider the cut of the grid (G_5, G_6) according to the extremum path P. If G_5 is the left side of the cut, then for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell$, the dual segment D^i is a subgraph of G_5.*

Proof. Consider (G_3, G_4) the cut of the grid associated associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$, let W' be the window of this cut and consider that G_3 is the left side of this cut. For all $0 \leq i \leq \ell$ the dual segment D^i is a subpath of W' and thus a subgraph of G_3. Now let W'' be the window of (G_5, G_6). Since G_5 is the left side of W'' and since G_3 is the left side of W' then G_3 is a subgraph of G_5. Thus for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell$, we have D^i is a subgraph of G_5. □

Now, we prove a technical lemma: consider $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$ then the intersection between the interior of D^i and the interior of D^j is a subset of $V(P)$. This result is needed to prove two powerful tools, Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.12.

Lemma 5.10. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W and a simple path P. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs according to G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W. Consider $0 \leq i < j \leq \ell$ such that either $i \neq 0$ or $j \neq \ell$ and let G_7 be the interior of D^i and let G_8 be the interior of D^j, then $V(G_7) \cap V(G_8) \subset V(P)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we suppose that G_1 is the left side of W. Let (G_3, G_4) be the cut of the grid associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and let W' be its window. We suppose that G_3 is the left side of W'. Then by lemma 5.6, the graph G_7 and G_8 are both subgraphs of G_4 (see Figure 46). We consider two cases: either $i = 0$ or $0 < i < j < \ell$. Note that the case $j = \ell$ is equivalent to $i = 0$.

Case $i = 0$: for an illustration of this proof, see Figure 50a. In this case consider **1** and **2** such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is the extremum path extracted from P and consider the cut of the grid (G_5, G_6) associated to P. Suppose that G_6 is the right side of this cut of the grid, then $G_7 = G_6$ and let $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the decomposition associated to $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and $(S^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ (resp. $(E^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$) the decomposition (resp. dual decomposition) of W associated to $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$. Since G_5 is the left side of the cut of the grid associated to P then by lemma 5.9, for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell'$, E^i is a subpath of G_5. Now by lemma 5.4, $V(D^j) \cap V(P) \subset \{D^j_1, D^j_{D^j}\}$. Thus either there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell'$ such that D^j is a subset of S^k or there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell' - 1$ such that D^j is a subset of E^k. In the first case either the arc A^j is dominated by B^k (which contradicts the definition of a decomposition in extremum arcs) or A^j intersects with B^k (which contradict the fact that P is a simple path). In the second case D^j is a subgraph of G_5 and since P is simple then G_8 is a subgraph of G_5 and thus $V(G_7) \cap V(G_8) \subset V(P)$.

Case $0 < i < j < \ell$: for an illustration of this proof, see Figure 50b. In this case, consider the cut of the grid (G_3, G_4) associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and let W' be its window. We suppose that G_3 is the left side of W'. Then G_7 and G_8 are subgraph of G_4. Now, let **1** and **2** such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = D^i_1$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}} = D^i_{|D^i|}$; let **3** and **4** such that $P_{\mathbf{3}} = D^j_1$ and $P_{\mathbf{4}} = D^j_{|D^j|}$; let **5** and **6** such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = W'_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}} = W'_{\mathbf{6}}$ and let **7** and **8** such that $P_{\mathbf{3}} = W'_{\mathbf{7}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{4}} = W'_{\mathbf{8}}$. We have $\mathbf{5} < \mathbf{6} \leq \mathbf{7} < \mathbf{8}$. Let C be the window of G_7 and let R such that $R = P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]}$ if $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{1}$ or R is equal to $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ where the indexing has been inverted if $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$. Then in both cases, we have $C = D^i \cdot R$, $R_1 = W_{\mathbf{6}}$ and $R_{|R|} = W_{\mathbf{5}}$. Let C' be the window of G_8 and let R' such that $R' = P_{[\mathbf{4},\mathbf{3}]}$ if $\mathbf{4} \leq \mathbf{3}$

or R' is equal to $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}]}$ where the indexing has been inverted if $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$. In both cases, we have $C' = D^j \cdot R'$, $R'_1 = W_{\mathbf{8}}$ and $R'_{|R|} = W_{\mathbf{7}}$. If R' is not a subgraph of R and if an edge of R' belongs to $E(G_7) \setminus E(R)$ then P is not simple. If R' is a subgraph of R then for the sake of contradiction suppose that G_8 is a subgraph of G_7. Remark that G_7 is the right side of C and G_8 is the right side of C'. Then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{9} < \mathbf{10} \leq |R|$ such that $R_{\mathbf{9}} = R'_1 = W_{\mathbf{8}}$ and $R_{\mathbf{10}} = R'_{|R'|} = W_{\mathbf{7}}$. Then $R_{[1,\mathbf{9}]}$ is an arc of G_4 such that $R_1 = W_{\mathbf{6}}$, $R_{\mathbf{9}} = W_{\mathbf{8}}$ and $R_{[\mathbf{10},|R|]}$ is an arc of G_4 such that $R_{\mathbf{10}} = W_{\mathbf{7}}$, $R_{|R|} = W_{\mathbf{5}}$. Since $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{6} < \mathbf{7} \leq \mathbf{8}$ then $R_{[1,\mathbf{9}]}$ intersects with $R_{[\mathbf{10},|R|]}$ and then R is not simple. Thus P is not simple which is an contradiction.

□

Now, we study the interactions of two non intersecting paths

Lemma 5.11. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W and a simple path P which starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs according to G_1 (which is the left side of W) and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W. Let (G_3, G_4) be the cut of the grid associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and let W' be its window. Suppose that G^3 is the left side of W'. Now, consider a simple path Q such that:*

- *$V(Q) \cap V(P) = \emptyset$;*
- *there exists no arc A of G^4 such that A is a subgraph of Q and A starts in $W_{\mathbf{3}}$ with $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{1}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{4}}$ with $\mathbf{4} \geq \mathbf{2}$);*
- *there exists $0 \leq c \leq d \leq \ell$ such that $Q_1 \in V(G_5)$ and $Q_{|Q|} \in V(G_6)$ where G_5 is the interior of D^c and G_6 is the interior of D^d;*
- *if $c = 0$ (resp. $d = \ell$) then $d < \ell$ (resp. $c > 0$) and $V(Q) \cap V(D^\ell) = \emptyset$ (resp. $V(Q) \cap V(D^0) = \emptyset$).*

Let $(B_i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the decomposition of Q into extremum arc in G_1 then for all $c + 1 \leq j \leq d$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$ such that the arc A^j is dominated by B^i.

Proof. See figure 51 for a graphical representation of the proof. For the sake of contradiction suppose that there exists $c + 1 \leq j \leq d$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$ the arc A^j is not dominated by B^i. Since either $c > 0$ or $d < \ell$, then by lemma 5.10, all positions which belongs to both the interior of D^c and the interior D^d are also positions of $V(P)$ and then since Q and P does not intersect then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |Q|$ such that $Q_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(D^c)$ and $Q_{\mathbf{4}} \in V(D^d)$. Let W' be the window associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$, then $Q_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(W')$ and $Q_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(W')$. Without loss of generality, we suppose that A^j is positive and let $\mathbf{6} \leq \mathbf{7}$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{6}} = A^j_1$ and $W'_{\mathbf{7}} = A^j_{|A^j|}$. Let $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4}$ such that $\mathbf{3} = \min\{i : \text{ there exists } k \geq \mathbf{6} \text{ such that } Q_i = W'_k\}$ (note that this index exists since $Q_{\mathbf{6}} \in V(D^d)$, D^d is a subgraph of W' and $d \geq j$). Let $\mathbf{8}$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{8}} = Q_{\mathbf{3}}$, by definition of $\mathbf{3}$ and since P and Q does not intersect then $\mathbf{8} > \mathbf{7}$. Now, let $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $\mathbf{2} = \max\{i < \mathbf{3} : \text{there exists } k \leq \mathbf{3} \text{ such that } Q_i = W'_k\}$ (note that this index exists since $Q_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(D^c)$, D^c is a subgraph of W' and $c < j$). Then, let $\mathbf{5}$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{5}} = Q_{\mathbf{2}}$. By definition of $\mathbf{2}$ and since P and Q does not intersect then $\mathbf{5} < \mathbf{6}$. Then, we have $\mathbf{5} < \mathbf{6} \leq \mathbf{7} < \mathbf{8}$. Now since P and Q does not intersect and by the definition of W', then there exists $c' < j$

and $d' \geq j$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{5}} \in V(D^{c'})$ and $W'_{\mathbf{8}} \in V(D^{d'})$. Now, by definition of **2** and **3**, we have $V(Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}) \cap V(W') = \{Q_{\mathbf{2}}, Q_{\mathbf{3}}\}$. Then the path $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is either an elementary arc of G_3 or an elementary arc of G_4. In the first case, since G_3 is a subgraph of G_1 then $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is also an arc of G_1 and this arc dominates A^j which is a contradiction (see Figure 51). If $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is an elementary arc of G_4 and if $c' = 0$ and $d' = \ell$, then the second hypothesis of our lemma is contradicted. Finally if $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is an elementary arc of G_4 and if $c' > 0$ (the case $d' < \ell$ is symmetric to this one) then let G^I be the interior of $D^{c'}$ and let C be its window. Remark that since $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is an arc of G_4 (which is the right side of W') then the edge $(Q_{\mathbf{2}}, Q_{\mathbf{2}+1}) \in V(G^I)$ (which is the right side of C). By definition of **2** and since P is simple then $V(Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}) \cap V(C) = \{Q_1\}$. Then $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is a subgraph of G^I and $Q_{\mathbf{3}} \in V(G^I)$. Since $Q_{\mathbf{3}}$ is also in the interior of $D^{d'}$, by lemma 5.10, we have $Q_{\mathbf{3}} \in V(P)$ which contradicts the fact that P and Q does not intersect. □

Now, we show that in some case there exists an index **2** such that $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ contain no relevant information.

Lemma 5.12. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a simple path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and an index $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(W)$. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ in G_1 and let $(D^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ be its dual decomposition of W. Consider $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ and let G^I be the interior of D^k and W' be its window. Then if $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of G^I and if $V(P) \cap V(W') \subset \{P_{\mathbf{2}}\}$ then the decomposition of P in extremum arcs in G_1 is $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$.*

Proof. See Figure 52 for an illustration of this proof. Let $(S^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ be the decomposition of W according to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$. Consider an arc A of G_1 which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ then $A_1 \in V(W)$ and $A_{|A|} \in V(W)$. If there exists $0 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that $A_1 \in V(D^j)$ then by lemma 5.4, since P is simple and since by hypothesis $V(P) \cap V(W') \subset \{P_{\mathbf{2}}\}$, then we have $A_1 = P_{\mathbf{2}}$. Moreover by lemma 5.4, either $P_{\mathbf{2}} = D^k_1 = S^k_{|S^k|}$ or $P_{\mathbf{2}} = D^k_{|D^k|} = S^{k+1}_1$. Same reasoning could be done with $A_{|A|}$ and then there exists $1 \leq i \leq j \leq \ell$ such that $A_1 \in V(S^i)$ and $A_{|A|} \in V(S^j)$. If $i < j$ then A intersects with both A^i and A^j which is a contradiction and if $i = j$ then this arc is dominated by A^i and does not appear in the decomposition of P in extremum arcs in G_1.

□

Now we want to study in what order the different arcs of the decomposition appear in P. We say that a decomposition is positive if all the arcs of the decomposition appears according to the indexing of P.

Definition 5.13. Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W and a simple path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P in extremum arcs in G_1. The decomposition is positive (resp. negative) if and only if for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, for all indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |A^i|$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |A^j|$ and for all indices $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{3}} = A^i_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{4}} = A^j_{\mathbf{2}}$, we have:

- if $i < j$ then $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$ (resp. $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{4}$);
- if $i = j$ and $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ then $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$ (resp. $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{4}$).

A decomposition in extremum arcs is not necessarily positive or negative, see a counter-example in Figure 42. Nevertheless, one of the final lemma of this section is that the decomposition in extremum arcs of an extremum positive path is always positive (see Lemma 5.25). Note that a similar property is always true for the dual: consider two indices $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ then if there exists $0 \leq i < j \leq |P|$ such that $W_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(D^i)$ and $W_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(D^j)$ then $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$. Also, if there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4} \leq |D^i|$ such that $W_{\mathbf{1}} = D^i_{\mathbf{3}}$ and $W_{\mathbf{2}} = D^i_{\mathbf{4}}$ then $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$. We state a sufficient condition for a path to be positive.

Fact 5.14. Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P, its decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ in extremum arcs in G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of W. If for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the arc A^i is positive (resp. negative) and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell-1$, the dual segment D^i is positive (resp. negative) then the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is positive (resp. negative).

Now, our aim is to prove that for a decomposition of a positive simple path there exists two values $1 \leq j \leq k \leq \ell$ such that for all $i < j$ or $i > k$, the arc A^i is negative and for all $j \leq i \leq k$ the arc A^i is positive (a similar property hold for the orientation of the dual segments). This result and Lemma 5.8 will imply that if P is extremum then its decomposition is positive. This result is obtained through a sequence of technical lemmas.

Lemma 5.15. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$. Consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ into extremum arcs in G_1 and let W' be the window associated to the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and let (G_3, G_4) be the cut defined by W'. We suppose that G_3 is a subgraph of G_1. Then the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}}+1)$ does not belong to $E(G_3)$.*

Proof. See Figures 53 and 54 for an illustration of this lemma. Let $m = w(A^i)$ be the width of arc A^i and consider an indexing of W such that $W_0 = A^i_1$ and $W_m = A^i_{|A^i|}$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}}+1)$ belongs to G_3. By hypothesis, G_3 is a subgraph of G_1 and then G_2 is a subgraph of G_4. Thus W is a subgraph of G_4 and since $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}}+1) \in E(G^3)$ then there exists $\mathbf{2} = \min\{i > \mathbf{1} : P_i \in V(W')\}$. Moreover, $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is an elementary arc of G_3. Now either $P_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]})$ or $P_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(W)$. In the first case, the path P is not simple which is a contradiction. In the second case, since by hypothesis G_3 is a subgraph of G_1, then $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is an elementary arc of G_1 and there exists $\mathbf{3}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{2}}$. If $\mathbf{3} < 0$ then the arc $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ dominates the arc A^i which contradicts the definition of A^i. If $0 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq m$ then P is not simple which is a contradiction. If $\mathbf{3} > m$ then let $1 \leq \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{0}} = A^i_1$ and thus the arc $P_{[\mathbf{0},\mathbf{1}]}$ dominates A^i which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 5.16. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and an index $1 < \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such $P_{\mathbf{3}} \in V(W)$. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}$ into extremum arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$. Now consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of the window W. Let (G_3, G_4) be the cut associated to the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$, we suppose that G_3 is a subgraph of G_1. Then there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell'$ such that $A^i = B^j$. Moreover if A^i is positive (resp. negative), let G^I be the interior of D^j (resp. D^{j-1}) and then the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}}+1)$ belongs either to $E(G^I)$ or to $E(G_3)$.*

Proof. This proof is made by a local reasoning along tile $P_{\mathbf{1}}$. First, consider the special case where $\mathbf{1} = 1$ then $i = 1$, $|A^1| = 1$. Moreover the window associated to A^1 is W and then $G^I = G_2$ and $G_3 = G_1$ and the edge (P_1, P_2) belongs either to G_3 or to G^I. Otherwise, we supposer that A^i is positive (the other case is symmetric) since $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$ then there exists $\mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$. Now, among the neighbors of $P_{\mathbf{1}}$, there are $P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$, $P_{\mathbf{1}+1}$, $W_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ and $W_{\mathbf{2}+1}$. Since W is simple then $W_{\mathbf{1}-1} \neq W_{\mathbf{1}+1}$ and since the arc A^i is positive then it ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and thus $W_{\mathbf{2}+1} \neq P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ and $W_{\mathbf{2}+1} \neq P_{\mathbf{1}+1}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $W_{\mathbf{2}+1} = W_{\mathbf{2}} + (0, 1)$. Since $P_{\mathbf{1}-1} \neq P_{\mathbf{1}+1}$ we are left with eighteen cases to study. This cases are classified in three categories:
Edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$: see Figure 55. A typical example of this case occurs when $W_{\mathbf{2}-1} = W_{\mathbf{2}} - (1, 0)$, $P_{\mathbf{1}+1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} + (1, 0)$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} - (0, 1)$. In this case, consider the window W' of G^I. Either W' is a finite cycle if $j < \ell'$ or W' is a the window associated to $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ if $i = \ell'$. In both cases, there exists $\mathbf{3}$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{3}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$, $W'_{\mathbf{3}+1} = W_{\mathbf{2}+1}$ and $W'_{\mathbf{3}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ and G^I is the right side of W'. In this case, the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is on the right side of $W'_{[\mathbf{3}-1,\mathbf{3}+1]}$ and thus this edge belong to G^I. The lemma is true in this case.

Edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ belongs to $E(G_3)$: see Figure 56. A typical example of this case occurs when $W_{\mathbf{2}-1} = W_{\mathbf{2}} + (1, 0)$, $P_{\mathbf{1}+1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} - (1, 0)$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} - (0, 1)$. In this case, consider the window W'' associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$, we suppose that G_3 is the left side of W'' and thus G_3 is a subgraph of G_1. With these conventions, there exists $\mathbf{4}$ such that $W''_{\mathbf{4}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$, $W''_{\mathbf{4}+1} = W_{\mathbf{2}+1}$ and either $W''_{\mathbf{4}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ if the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}} - 1, P_{\mathbf{1}})$ belongs to $E(G_1)$ or $W''_{\mathbf{4}-1} = W_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ otherwise (in this case $|A^i| = 1$). In this case, the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is on the left side of $W''_{[\mathbf{4}-1,\mathbf{4}+1]}$ and thus this edge belong to G_3. The lemma is true in this case.

Arc A^i is a negative arc of length 1: see the combination of the two dotted neighborhood of Figure 56. This case occurs only time when $W_{\mathbf{2}-1} = W_{\mathbf{2}} - (1, 0)$, $P_{\mathbf{1}+1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} - (0, 1)$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}} + (1, 0)$. In this case, by definition 5.5, the arc A^i is a negative arc of length 1 which contradicts the hypothesis that A^i is positive.

□

For Lemma 5.16, when $\mathbf{3} = |P|$ where are in case where the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}} + 1)$ cannot belongs to G_3 by lemma 5.13. Thus we have the following corollary (see Figure 54b).

Corollary 5.17. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{1} < |P|$ and consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of the window W then there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell'$ such that $A^i = B^j$. Moreover if A^i is positive (resp. negative), let G^I be the interior of D^j (resp. D^{j-1}) and then the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}} + 1)$ belongs to G^I.*

Now, that we have dealt with the technical lemmas, we start by studying the orientation of the dual segments. This first lemma studies the orientation of the dual segment between two positives arcs.

Lemma 5.18. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum*

arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$ such that A^i and A^j are both positive (resp. negative) arcs and let $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^j_{|A^j|}$. If P is positive (resp. negative) then $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ (resp. $\mathbf{1} > \mathbf{2}$).

Proof. Let $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}]}$ is the extremum arcs extracted from P. We suppose that $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}]}$ is positive (the other case is symmetric) then A^i and A^j are both positive. By contradiction suppose that $\mathbf{1} > \mathbf{2}$. See Figure 57a for an illustration of this setting. We distinguish three cases, $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{2}$, $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{1}$. The last case generates two sub-cases. We now show that they all lead to a contradiction.

Case $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{2}$: see Figure 57b for an illustration of this case. In this case, consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$ and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the dual decomposition of W associated to $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$. Note that, there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell'$ such that $B^k = A^j$. Let G^I be the interior of D^k. Since $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$ then $\mathbf{2} < |P|$ and since B^k is positive, then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover, since $i < j$ there exists $k' < k$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in D^{k'}$. Moreover since $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{1}$ then $k' \geq 1$. By definition of $P_{\mathbf{3}}$, we have $V(D^0) \cap V(P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{1}]}) = \emptyset$ and then there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{1}]}$. Moreover, since P is simple then $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{1}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$. Then by applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{1}]}$, there exists an arc A which dominates $B^k = A^j$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{1}]}$ which is a contradiction.

Case $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3}$: see Figure 57c for an illustration of this case. In this case, let $1 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq |P|$ be such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} = A^j_1$ then $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{2}$ and consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{1}]}$ and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the dual decomposition of W associated to $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$. Note that, there exists $1 \leq i' \leq j' \leq \ell'$ such that $B^{i'} = A^i$ and $B^{j'} = A^j$. Let G^I be the interior of $D^{i'}$. Since $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{4}$ then $\mathbf{1} < |P|$ and since $B^{i'}$ is positive, then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover, by definition of $\mathbf{4}$, we have $P_{\mathbf{4}} \in D^{\ell'}$ and then there exists $\mathbf{6} = \min\{i > \mathbf{5} : P_i \in D^0 \text{ or } D^{\ell'}\}$. By definition of $\mathbf{6}$, there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{1}+1,\mathbf{6}]}$. Moreover, since P is simple then $P_{[\mathbf{1}+1,\mathbf{6}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{1}]}$. Then by applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{1}+1,\mathbf{6}]}$, if $P_{\mathbf{6}} \in V(D^0)$ (resp. $V(D^{\ell'})$) then there exists an arc A which dominates $B^{i'} = A^i$ (resp. $B^{j'} = A^j$) and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{6}]}$ which is a contradiction.

Case $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{1}$: in this case, let $1 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq |P|$ be such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} = A^j_1$, then $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{2}$ and let $1 \leq \mathbf{6} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{6}} = A^1_{|A^1|}$. By definition of $\mathbf{3}$ we have either $A^1_1 = P_{\mathbf{3}}$ (if A^1 is positive) or $A^1_{|A^1|} = P_{\mathbf{3}}$ (if A^1 is negative), in both cases we have $\mathbf{6} \geq \mathbf{3}$. We have $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{4}$ otherwise A^1 would dominate A^i and A^j and then $\mathbf{6} < |P|$. Now, consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6}]}$ and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be its dual decomposition of W. Note that $A^1 = B^1$ and that there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell'$ such that $B^k = A^j$. Now, we distinguish two subcases either B^1 is positive or negative.

Sub-case B^1 is positive: see Figure 57d for an illustration of this case. Let G^I be the interior of D^1. Since B^1 is positive, then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{6}}, P_{\mathbf{6}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover by definition of $\mathbf{3}$, we have $V(D^0) \cap V(P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{4}]}) = \emptyset$ and then there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{4}]}$. Moreover, since P is simple then $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{4}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6}]}$. Also by definition of $\mathbf{4}$, we have $P_{\mathbf{4}} \in V(D^{\ell'})$.

Then by applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{4}]}$, there exists an arc A which dominates $B^k = A^j$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{4}]}$ which is a contradiction.

Sub-case B^1 is negative: see Figure 57e for an illustration of this case. Let G^I be the interior of D^0. Since B^1 is negative, then by lemma 5.17, the edge $(P_{\mathbf{6}}, P_{\mathbf{6}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover by definition of $\mathbf{4}$, we have $P_{\mathbf{4}} \in V(D^{\ell'})$, then there exists $\mathbf{7} = \min\{i > \mathbf{6} : P_{\mathbf{7}} \in V(D^{\ell'})\}$. Note that since P is a simple path, then $P_{[\mathbf{6},\mathbf{7}]}$ is a subgraph of G^I. Moreover, since $i < j$ there exists $k' < k$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} \in D^{k'}$ and since $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{1}$ then $k' \geq 1$. Thus by lemma 5.10, we have $\mathbf{7} < \mathbf{1}$. By definition of $P_{\mathbf{3}}$, we have $V(D^0) \cap V(P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{1}]}) = \emptyset$ and then there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{1}]}$. Moreover, since P is a simple path then $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{1}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6}]}$. Then by applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{1}]}$, there exists an arc A which dominates $B^k = A^j$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{1}]}$ which is a contradiction.

□

This second lemma studies the case where the dual segment and its following arc have an opposite orientation.

Lemma 5.19. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$, the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W. Consider $1 \leq i < \ell$ (resp. $1 < i \leq \ell$) such that D^i is positive (resp. negative) and A^{i+1} is negative (resp. A^i is positive). Let G^I be the interior of D^i and let $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^{i+1}_{|A^{i+1}|}$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$) then $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of G^I and $V(P) \cap V(D^i) = \{P_{\mathbf{1}}\}$.*

Proof. We consider the case where D^i is positive and A^{i+1} is negative, see Figure 58. In this case, let $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$ if A^i is positive or $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^i_1$ otherwise. Since D^i is negative, we have $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$. Moreover, let C be the window of G^I, then $C = P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]} \cdot D^i$. Now consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ and let $E^i_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be its dual decomposition of W'. Since $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$ there exists j such that $B^j = A^i$ and $B^{j+1} = A^{i+1}$. Thus $D^i = E^j$ and the interior of E^j is G^I. Moreover, by lemma 5.17, $P_{\mathbf{1}+1} \in V(G^I)$. Since P is simple and by lemma 5.4 then $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of G^I.

□

Since P is simple then a corollary of this result and of lemma 5.12 is that the end of the path assembly contains not relevant information.

Corollary 5.20. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$, the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W. Consider $1 \leq i < \ell$ (resp. $1 < i \leq \ell$) such that D^i is positive (resp. negative) and A^{i+1} is negative (resp. A^i is positive). Let G^I be the interior of D^i and let $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^{i+1}_{|A^{i+1}|}$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$) then the decomposition of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ is $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$.*

Same reasoning could be done after switching the indexing of path P and we obtain the following result, see Figure 59a.

Corollary 5.21. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$, the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W. Consider $1 \leq i < \ell$ (resp. $1 < i \leq \ell$) such that D^i is positive (resp. negative) and A^i is negative (resp. A^{i+1} is positive). Let G^I be the interior of D^i and let $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_1$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^{i+1}_1$) then the decomposition of $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$.*

The two previous corollaries lead to a special case occurring when a positive dual segment is surrounded between two positive arcs, see Figure 59b.

Corollary 5.22. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$, the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W. Consider $1 \leq i < \ell$ such that A^i is positive, A^{i+1} is positive and D^i is negative. Let G^I be the interior of D^i and let $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{A^i}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^{i+1}_1$ then the decomposition of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$.*

Now we deal with the orientation of the arcs.

Lemma 5.23. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i < j < k \leq \ell$ such that A^i and A^k are both positive (resp. negative) arcs. If P is positive (resp. negative) then A^j is positive (resp. negative).*

Proof. We suppose that P is positive, the other case is symmetric. Consider the six indices $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_1$, $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$, $P_{\mathbf{3}} = A^j_1$, $P_{\mathbf{4}} = A^j_{|A^j|}$, $P_{\mathbf{5}} = A^k_1$ and $P_{\mathbf{6}} = A^k_{|A^k|}$. By definition $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$, $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{6}$. Moreover, by lemma 5.18, we have $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{5}$. For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that A^j is negative. We now distinguish three cases which are $\mathbf{4} < \mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} < \mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{3}$, see Figure 60a.

Case $\mathbf{4} < \mathbf{1}$: see Figure 60b for an illustration of this case. Consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$ and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the dual decomposition of W according to $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$. Note that there exists $1 \leq i' < j' \leq \ell'$ such that $B^{i'} = A^i$ and $B^{j'} = A^j$. Let G^I be the interior of $D^{i'}$. Since $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{5}$, we have $\mathbf{2} < |P|$ and since $B^{i'}$ is positive, then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover, since $i < j < k$ there exists $k' \geq j'$ such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} \in V(D^{k'})$. Then there exists $\mathbf{7} = \min\{i > \mathbf{2} :$ there exists a such that $P_i \in D^a$ with $a < i'$ or $a \geq j'\}$. By definition of $\mathbf{7}$, there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$. Moreover, since P is simple then $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$. Then by applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$, there exists an arc A which dominates either $B^{i'} = A^i$ or $B^{j'} = A^j$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ which is a contradiction.

Case $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} < \mathbf{5}$: see Figure 60c for an illustration of this case. Consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{4}]}$ and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the dual decomposition of W according to $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$. Note that there exists $1 \leq i' < j' \leq \ell'$ such that $B^{i'} = A^i$ and $B^{j'} = A^j$. Let G^I be the interior of $D^{j'-1}$. Since $\mathbf{4} < \mathbf{5}$, we have $\mathbf{4} < |P|$ and since $B^{i'}$ is negative, then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{4}}, P_{\mathbf{4}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover, since $i < j < k$ there exists $k' \geq j'$ such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} \in D^{k'}$. Then there exists $\mathbf{7} = \min\{i > \mathbf{4} :$ there exists a such that $P_i \in D^a$ with $a < i'$ or $a \geq j'\}$. By definition of $\mathbf{7}$, there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{4}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$. Moreover, since P is simple then $P_{[\mathbf{4}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{4}]}$. Then by

applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{4}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$, there exists an arc A which dominates either $B^{i'} = A^i$ or $B^{j'} = A^j$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ which is a contradiction.

Case $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{3}$: see Figure 60d for an illustration of this case. Consider the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{6}]}$ and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell'}$ be the dual decomposition of W according to $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$. Note that there exists $1 \leq i' \leq k' \leq \ell'$ such that $B^{i'} = A^i$ and $B^{k'} = A^k$. Let G^I be the interior of $D^{k'}$. Since $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{3}$, we have $\mathbf{6} < |P|$ and since $B^{k'}$ is positive, then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{6}}, P_{\mathbf{6}+1})$ belongs to $E(G^I)$. Moreover, since $i < j < k$ there exists $i' \leq j' < k'$ such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} \in D^{j'}$. Then there exists $\mathbf{7} = \max\{i < \mathbf{5} :$ there exists a such that $P_i \in D^a$ with $a < i'$ or $a \geq j'\}$. By definition of $\mathbf{7}$, we have $\mathbf{6} + 1 \leq \mathbf{7}$ and there exists no arc which starts in D^0 and ends in $D^{\ell'}$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{5}]}$. Moreover, since P is a simple path then $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{5}]}$ does not intersect with $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{6}]}$. Then by applying lemma 5.11 on $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{5}]}$, there exists an arc A which dominates either $B^{i'} = A^i$ or $B^{k'} = A^k$ and which is a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{5}]}$ which is a contradiction.

□

Now, we can prove the main lemma of this section.

Lemma 5.24. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs in G_1. Let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ be the dual decomposition of W according to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$. If P is positive (resp. negative), then there exist $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ such that for all $i < j$ or $i > k$ the arc A^i is negative (resp. positive) and for all $j \leq i \leq k$ the arc A^i is positive (resp. negative). Moreover, for all $j \leq i \leq k-1$ the dual segment D^i is positive (resp. negative), for all $i < j-1$ or $i > k$ the dual segment D^i is negative (resp. positive).*

Proof. We consider that P is positive, the other case is symmetric. If for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the arc A^i is negative then let $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^1_{|A^1|}$ and let $\mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^\ell_1$ (see Figure 61). Since P is positive and $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$ then there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ such that the dual segment D^i is positive. Now, suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$ such that the dual segment D^j is positive and $j \neq i$. Then let $\mathbf{3}$ (resp. $\mathbf{4}$) such that $P_{\mathbf{3}} = A^i_1$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{4}} = A^j_1$). Without loss of generality, we suppose that $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$ then A^i is not a subgraph of $P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ but by corollary 5.22, the decomposition of $P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ in extremum arc in G_1 is $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ which is a contradiction. Then D^i is the only positive dual segment. Let $j = i + 1$ and $k = i$ and the lemma is true.

Now suppose that there exists at least one positive arc, then we can define $j = \min\{i :$ A^i is positive$\}$ and $k = \max\{i : A^i$ is positive$\}$. Then by lemma 5.23, for all $j \leq i \leq k$, the arc A^i is positive. By definition of j and k, for all $i < j$ or $i > k$ the arc A^i is negative. Now, by lemma 5.18, for all $j \leq i \leq k - 1$ the dual segment D^i is positive. Now for the sake the contradiction suppose that there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ such that $i < j - 1$ or $i > k$ and D^i is positive. We consider that $i > k$, the other case is symmetric. We also consider that D^k is positive, the other case is symmetric. Then let $\mathbf{5}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{5}} = A^{k+1}_{|A^{k+1}|}$ and let $\mathbf{6}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{6}} = A^{i+1}_{|A^{i+1}|}$. If $\mathbf{5} < \mathbf{6}$ (resp. $\mathbf{5} > \mathbf{6}$) then A^{i+1} (resp. A^{k+1}) is not a subgraph of $P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}$ (resp. $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$) but by corollary 5.19 (resp. corollary 5.22), the decomposition of $P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}$ (resp. $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$) in extremum arc in G_1 is $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ which is a contradiction. Then for all $i < j - 1$ or $i > k$ the dual segment D^i is negative.

□

Applying the previous lemma on an extremum path P leads to the following result.

Lemma 5.25. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its window W and a simple finite extremum path P then the decomposition of P in extremum arcs is positive (resp. negative) if P is positive (resp. negative).*

Proof. We consider that P is positive, the other case is symmetric. Let $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ be the decomposition of P into extremum arcs and let $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ be the dual decomposition of W according to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$. By fact 5.8, the arcs A^1 and A^ℓ are both positive. Then by lemma 5.24, for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ the arc A^i is positive and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ the dual segment D^i is positive. Then by fact 5.14, the decomposition of P in extremum arcs is positive. □

Note that we have defined the decomposition into extremum arcs for a path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$. Now we generalize our result to a path P such that $V(P) \cap V(W)$ is finite. In this case, there exists $\mathbf{1}$ (resp. $\mathbf{2}$) such that $\mathbf{1} = \min\{i : P_i \in V(W)\}$ (resp. $\mathbf{2} = \max\{i : P_i \in V(W)\}$), we define the decomposition of P into extremum arcs as the decomposition of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ into extremum arcs.

We end this section with a sequence of three technical lemmas/remarks which will be useful later. These lemma deals with the position of the first edge of a dual segment. Our final aim is illustrated in Figure 63.

Lemma 5.26. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a simple path P. We suppose that G_1 is the left side of the cut and that there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} = A$, $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a positive arc of P, that $1 < \mathbf{2} < |P|$. Now, consider the window W' associated to arc $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and its cut (G_3, G_4) of the grid. We suppose that G_3 is a subgraph of G_1 and that G_2 is a subgraph of G_3. Now assume that $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}+1]}$ is strictly on the right side of W'. Then there exists $\mathbf{3}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{2}}$ and moreover $(W_{\mathbf{3}}, W_{\mathbf{3}+1})$ is strictly on the right side of P.*

Proof. This proof is made by a local reasoning around tile $P_{\mathbf{2}}$. By definition there exists $\mathbf{4}$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{4}} = P_{\mathbf{2}} = W_{\mathbf{3}}$ and since $1 < \mathbf{2} < |P|$ the positions $P_{\mathbf{2}-1}$, $P_{\mathbf{2}+1}$, $W'_{\mathbf{4}-1}$ and $W'_{\mathbf{4}+1}$ are neighbors of $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ in G. Since $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is positive and extremum then $P_{\mathbf{2}-1} \neq W'_{\mathbf{4}+1}$. Since the edge $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ is strictly on the right side of W' then $P_{\mathbf{2}+1} \neq W'_{\mathbf{4}-1}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}+1} \neq W'_{\mathbf{4}+1}$. Then $W'_{\mathbf{4}+1} = W_{\mathbf{3}+1}$ and without loss of generality, we suppose that $W'_{\mathbf{4}+1} = W'_{\mathbf{4}} + (0, 1)$. Finally remark that the edge $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ cannot belongs to $E(G_3) \setminus E(W')$ otherwise it would contradict the definition of W'. Figure 62 represents the different possible cases and in all possible cases the edge $(W_{\mathbf{3}}, W_{\mathbf{3}+1}) = (W'_{\mathbf{4}}, W'_{\mathbf{4}+1})$ is strictly on the left side of $P_{[\mathbf{2}-1,\mathbf{2}+1]}$.

□

Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, a finite path P and its decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ into extremum arcs in G_1. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ then around tile $A^i_{|A^i|}$ the window associated to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and the window associated to A^i are identical. Then, a corollary of lemma 5.26 and lemma 5.15 leads to the following result.

Corollary 5.27. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, a finite path P such that $P_1 \in V(W)$ and $P_{|P|} \in V(W)$ and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of P into extremum*

arcs in G_1 and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$. Suppose that $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$, that A^i is positive and that G_1 is the left side of W. Let $\mathbf{3}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{1}}$, then the edge $(W_{\mathbf{3}}, W_{\mathbf{3}+1})$ is strictly on the left side of $P_{[\mathbf{1}-1,\mathbf{1}+1]}$.

Lemma 5.28. *Consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W and a simple positive path P such that $V(P) \cap V(W)$ is finite. Suppose that there exists $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$ such that $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ is the extremum path extracted from P. Let (G_3, G_4) be the cut of the grid associated to P. Suppose that G_1 is the left side W, that G_3 is the left side of W' and that $|A^1| > 1$. If $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of G_4 then for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, there exists $1 < \mathbf{2} < |P|$ such that the edge (D^i_1, D^i_2) is strictly on the left side of $P_{[\mathbf{2}-1,\mathbf{2}+1]}$.*

Proof. By lemma 5.12, the decomposition of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ in extremum arcs in G_1 is the same as the one of P. Since by hypothesis P is positive then by lemma 5.25, the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is positive. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and since A^i is positive then $A^i_{|A^i|} = D^i_1$. Let $\mathbf{3}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{3}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$. By lemma 5.8, $P_1 = A^1_1$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^\ell_{|A^\ell|}$ then $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{1}$. Since by hypothesis $|A^1| > 1$ then $\mathbf{3} > 1$. Then by corollary 5.27, the edge (D^i_1, D^i_2) is strictly on the left side of $P_{[\mathbf{3}-1,\mathbf{3}+1]}$. Now if $|A^\ell| > 2$ then A^ℓ is a positive arc. Moreover since $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of G_4 then the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is strictly on the left side of W'. Then by lemma 5.26, the edge (D^ℓ_1, D^ℓ_2) is strictly on the left side of $P_{[\mathbf{1}-1,\mathbf{1}+1]}$ (remark that locally W' and the window associated to A^ℓ are identical). Finally, if $|A^\ell| = 1$ then if the arc A^ℓ is negative in P, let (G_5, G_6) be the cut of the grid associated to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$. Suppose that G_5 is the left side of this cut, then G_5 is a subgraph of both G_1 and G_3. Then by lemma 5.17 the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is either in the interior of $D^\ell - 1$ which is subgraph of G_3 or in G_5 which is a subgraph of G_3, both cases contradict the hypothesis of the lemma. Then A^ℓ is also a positive arc of P. Then by lemma 5.26, the edge (D^ℓ_1, D^ℓ_2) is strictly on the left side of $P_{[\mathbf{1}-1,\mathbf{1}+1]}$. □

5.4 Application of the toolbox

In this subsection, we prove a technical result which will a key argument of theorem 7.36. This result is long to prove and several technical difficulties need to be overcome. We prove it here to illustrate an application of our toolbox and to avoid making a lengthy technical interlude in section 7.4.

This result requires a very specific setting, see Figure 68 of appendix D.1. We consider a cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) and its bi-infinite window W (in fact, this cut of this grid will be a cut of the grid done by a path with visible extremities). Next, we consider a good path C such that the extension $C^{+\omega}$ splits G_1 into (G_1^-, G_1^+). Finally, we consider a good arc A of G_1^+ such that $A_0 = C_0$, $A_{|P|} = C_{|C|}$. We aim to show that either the extension $A^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+ or we can find another path R which splits G_1^+. Later, this lemma will be used as follow: the path $C^{+\omega}$ corresponds to a failed attempt of pumping a candidate segment whereas the arc A correspond to a new attempt to pump another candidate segment. If $A^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+ then the candidate segment A will be pumpable otherwise we can find the path R which corresponds to the failed attempt of pumping A. In this case, $R^{+\omega}$ will replace $C^{+\omega}$ and we will find another candidate segment. This reasoning will be repeated until a pumpable candidate segment is found. This lemma is proven in three steps. In the first step, we show that the good arc A can be decomposed in a sequence of elementary arcs of G_1^+. In the second step, we show

that for any basic path, we can find a basic arc of G_1^+ such that the restrained interior of this arc is a subgraph of the restrained interior of the path. Finally, in the last step we conclude this subsection using the two previous results.

In the following definition, we introduce the decomposition of an extremum arc in a sequence of elementary arcs. Here we consider a sequence of arcs $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell-1$ the arc A^{i+1} is consecutive to A^i. The decomposition and the dual decomposition of the window associated to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is defined as in a decomposition in extremum arcs. Nevertheless, in this case a dual segment could be of length one since the arcs $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ may not be strictly consecutive, see Figure 64 for an illustration of these notions and of the following definition.

Definition 5.29. Consider a cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W, two indexes $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{4}$ and a positive extremum arc A of C^+ which starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{4}}$. Consider a sequence of arcs $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell-1$ the arc A^{i+1} is consecutive to A^i. Consider the dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of the window W associated to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$. This sequence is a decomposition of A into elementary arcs if and only if for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, A^i is a subpath of A, A^i is a positive elementary arc and there exists two indices $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4}$ such that $A = W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} \cdot_{1\leq i\leq \ell-1} (A^i \cdot D^i) \cdot A^\ell \cdot W_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}]}$.

We now prove that for any extremum arc, there always exists a decomposition of this arc into elementary arcs.

Lemma 5.30. *Consider a cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid, its bi-infinite window W and a positive extremum arc A of C^+ then there exists a decomposition of A into elementary arcs.*

Proof. Let $m = w(A)$ be the width of A. Without loss of generality, we suppose that the arc A starts in W_0 and ends in W_m. Since A is positive and extremum then $A_1 = W_0$ and $A_{|A|} = W_m$. Let $\ell = |\{i : 1 \leq i \leq |A| - 1 \text{ and } A_i \in V(W) \text{ and } (A_i, A_{i+1}) \notin E(W)\}|$ and we define $\mathbf{1} = 1$ and $\mathbf{2\ell + 2} = |A|$, for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ we define $1 \leq \mathbf{2i} \leq |A|$ as $\mathbf{2i} = \min\{j : j \geq \mathbf{2i - 1} \text{ and } (A_j, A_{j+1}) \notin E(W)\}$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ we define $1 \leq \mathbf{2i + 1} \leq |A|$ as $\mathbf{2i + 1} = \min\{j : j > \mathbf{2i} \text{ and } A_j \in V(W)\}$. By definition of ℓ this sequence of indexes is correctly defined. Now, for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ we define the arc A^i as $A_{[\mathbf{2i},\mathbf{2i+1}]}$. Note that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the arc A^i is elementary and $|A^i| > 1$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq 2\ell$, $A_{[\mathbf{2i+1},\mathbf{2(i+1)}]}$ is a subgraph of the window W. Also since A is a simple path then for all $1 \leq j < k \leq \ell$, then either $V(A^j) \cap V(A^k) = \emptyset$ or $V(A^j) \cap V(A^k) = A^j_{|A^j|} = A^k_1$ and $k = j + 1$. Moreover, by definition of $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2\ell + 1}$, we have $A = \cdot_{1\leq i\leq 2\ell} A_{[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i+1}]}$. Now if for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, A^i is positive and if for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$, A^{i+1} is consecutive to A^i then for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$, we have $A_{[\mathbf{2i+1},\mathbf{2(i+1)}]} = D^i$ (where $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ is the dual decomposition of W according to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$). In this case, $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is a decomposition of A into elementary arcs.

Otherwise for the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ such that $k = \min\{1 \leq i \leq \ell : A^i \text{ is negative or } i > 1 \text{ and } A^i \text{ is not consecutive to } A^{i-1}\}$. Then consider the arc $B = \cdot_{1\leq i\leq 2(k-1)} A_{[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i+1}]}$ (see Figure 65). Note that B is an extremum arc and that $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq k-1}$ is a decomposition of B in elementary arcs. Moreover, B starts in W_0 and ends in $A_{\mathbf{2k-1}} = A^{k-1}_{|A^{k-1}|}$. Now let w, x, y and z such that $W_w = A_{\mathbf{2k-2}} = A^{k-1}_1$, $W_x = A_{\mathbf{2k-1}} = A^{k-1}_{|A^{k-1}|}$, $W_y = A_{\mathbf{2k}} = A^k_1$ and $W_z = A_{\mathbf{2k+1}} = A^k_{|A^k|}$. Since A^{k-1} is positive then $w < x$. To conclude this proof, we consider two cases: $y > x$ or $x \leq y$.

Case $y > x$: see Figure 65b for an illustration of this case. Since $y > x$ then by definition of k, the arc A^k is negative and we have $z < y$ and since A is extremum then $z > 0$. Thus, the arc $A^k = A_{[\mathbf{2k},\mathbf{2k+1}]}$ intersects with $B \cdot A_{[\mathbf{2k-1},\mathbf{2k}]}$ which contradicts the fact that A is a simple path.

Case $x < y$: see Figure 65c for an illustration of this case. If $y \leq w$ then since $A_{[\mathbf{2k-1},\mathbf{2k}]} = W_{[y,x]}$ then $A_{\mathbf{2k-2}} \in A_{[\mathbf{2k-1},\mathbf{2k}]}$ and thus A is not simple which is a contradiction. Otherwise, $w < y$. Since A is an arc of G_1, then $A_{[\mathbf{2k+1},|A|]}$ is an arc of G_1. Moreover, since $w < y < x$ and since $A_{|A|} \notin W_{[x,y]}$ then $A_{[\mathbf{2k},|A|]}$ intersects with A^{k-1} which is a contradiction.

Case $x = y$: in this case, either $z \leq w$ and this case is similar to the case $y > x$ or $z > w$ and this case is similar to the case $x < y$.

□

Now we prove the second step of our result.

Lemma 5.31. *Consider a window W and its cut of the grid (G_1, G_2). Consider a basic path P, let $\mathbf{1}$ (resp. $\mathbf{2}$) such that $P_1 = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. $P_{|P|} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$). Suppose that P starts in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and that the edge $(P_{|P|-1}, P_{|P|})$ belongs to $E(G_1)$. Then there exists a basic arc A of G_1 such that the restrained interior of A is a subgraph of the restrained interior of P and if P is not an arc of G_1 then $V(A) \cap V(W_{[\mathbf{1}+1,+\infty]}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. See Figure 66a, for an illustration of a path P which satisfies the hypothesis of this lemma. Since P starts in $W_{\mathbf{2}} = P_{|P|}$ and since P is basic then P is negative and $V(P) \cap V(W_{[-\infty,\mathbf{1}]}) = \{P_1, P_{|P|}\}$. Since $P_1 \in V(W)$, there exists $\mathbf{4} = \max\{i < |P| : P_i \in V(W)\}$. Moreover, since $(P_{|P|-1}, P_{|P|}) \in E(G_1)$ then $P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ is an elementary arc of G_1. Remark that if $\mathbf{4} = 1$ then P is an elementary arc of G_1 and the lemma is true with $A = P$. Otherwise $\mathbf{4} > 1$ and let $\mathbf{3}$ be such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{4}}$ and then $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{1}$. Consider a decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ into extremum arcs in G_1 (see Figure 66b) and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of the window W. Also, let G^I be the restrained interior of P. To conclude the proof we proceed in three steps, first we analyze some properties of the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$. Then we explain how we build the arc A and we conclude by showing that A is a subgraph of G^I.

Analysis of the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$: firstly, since $\mathbf{4} < |P|$ then $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]} \cap W_{[-\infty,\mathbf{1}]} = \{P_1\}$ and by lemma 5.7, we have $A^1_1 = P_1$ and A^1 is a positive arc of $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$. Secondly, by lemma 5.4, there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that $P_{\mathbf{4}}$ belongs to the interior of A^j. Now if $P_{\mathbf{4}} \notin V(A^j)$ then since $P_{|P|} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$, since $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$ and since $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ then the arc A^j intersects with the arc $P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$; this fact would contradict that P is simple. Then, $P_{\mathbf{4}} \in V(A^j)$ and since $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ is the decomposition of $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ then $A^j_{|A^j|} = P_{\mathbf{4}}$. Now if $j = 1$ then $\ell = 1$ and $P = A^1 \cdot P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ then P is an arc of G_1 and the lemma is true with $A = P$. Otherwise $j > 1$ and since $A^j_{|A^j|} = P_{\mathbf{4}}$ then the dual segment D^{j-1} is positive. Moreover, since A^1 is positive by lemma 5.24 for all $1 \leq i \leq j-1$, the arc A^i is positive.

Definition of the arc A: if A^j is negative then let $A = \cdot_{1 \leq i \leq j-1}(A^i \cdot D^i) \cdot P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$, otherwise let $A = \cdot_{1 \leq i \leq j-1}(A^i \cdot D^i) \cdot A^j \cdot P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ (see Figure 67a). Since P is a basic path and since $P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ is an elementary arc of G_1 then A is a basic arc of G_1 such that $A_1 = P_1$, $A_{|P|} = P_{|P|}$ and $W_{\mathbf{3}} \in (V(A) \cap V(W_{[\mathbf{1}+1,+\infty]}))$.

The arc Q is a subgraph of G^I: let C be the window of G^I (see Figure 67b). Let $Q = W_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]} \cdot A$, then Q is a simple cycle and is the window of the restrained interior of A (see Figure 67c). Let

$m = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{2}$ then $m > 0$. Without loss of generality we suppose that G_1 is the left side of the cut of the grid and we consider an indexing of C such that $C_0 = W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $C_m = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ then G^I is the left side of C. Now remark that $Q_{[0,m]} = W_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]} = C_{[0,m]}$, that $P_{[\mathbf{4},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of P and thus a subgraph of C and that for all $1 \leq i \leq j$, the arc A^i is a subpath of P and thus a subpath of C. Then, all these paths are subgraphs of G^I. Now, let $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ be the sequence of arcs such that $B^1 = C_{[0,m]} \cdot A^1$ and for all $2 \leq i \leq j$, we have $B^i = A^i$. Then this sequence is the decomposition of $C_{[0,m]} \cdot P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ in extremum arcs in G_1. Since $m > 0$ then $|B^1| > 1$ and remark that $C_{[0,m]} \cdot P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is a subgraph of C. Now, consider $1 \leq i \leq j-1$, since $|B^1| > 1$ and A^i is positive, then by lemma 5.27 the edge (D^i_1, D^i_2) is strictly on the left side of C and thus in $E(G^I)$. Moreover, by lemma 5.4, $V(D^i) \cap V(P) = \{D^i_1, D^i_{|D^i|}\}$ then $V(D^i) \cap V(C) = \{D^i_1, D^i_{|D^i|}\}$ and thus D^i is a subgraph of G^I. Then the arc A is a subgraph of G^I and the restrained interior of A is a subgraph of G^I.

□

Finally we can state the main lemma of this subsection.

Lemma 5.32. *Consider a cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) by a bi-infinite window W, an index $\mathbf{1}$ and a simple good path C of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and $C^{+\omega}$ splits G_1 into (G_1^-, G_1^+) at position $W_{\mathbf{1}}$. Consider a good arc A of G_1^+ of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $A_1 = C_1$ and $A_{|A|} = C_{|C|}$ then either $A^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+ or there exists a good path R of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $R_1 = C_1$, $R^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+ and there exists $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{3} \geq |R|$ such that $R^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{3}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and such that $y_{W_{\mathbf{2}}} \geq \min\{y_C, y_Q\} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$.*

Proof. This proof is done in three steps and relies on an algorithm to obtain the desired result. An example of this algorithm is illustrated in the Figures of appendix D.1, the input of the algorithm is Figure 68. During the first step of the proof, we decompose the arc A into several elementary arcs to obtain a correct input for our algorithm (see Figure 69). Now for each arc of this decomposition, the second step introduces a loop of the algorithm which modifies this arc (see Figures 70 and 71 for arc A^1 and Figure 72 for arc A^2). The third step puts together all the different modified arcs of A to build the path R and proves that the path R matches the hypothesis of the lemma (see Figure 73). Without loss of generality, we consider that G_1 is the left side of W and that G_1^+ is the right side of $C^{+\omega}$.

Input of the algorithm: consider the cut of the grid (C^+, C^-) associated to the periodic bi-infinite window $W' = C^\omega$. We suppose that C^+ is the right side of the cut. Let $p = |C| - 1$ and consider an indexing of W' such that $W'_0 = C_1 = A_1$ and $W'_p = C_{|C|} = A_{|A|}$. Now let $\mathbf{4} = \min\{i : A_{[\mathbf{4},|A|]} \text{ is a subgraph of } C^+\}$. Since A is a subgraph of G_1^+ then the edge $(A_{|A|-1}, A_{|A|}) \in E(C^+)$ and thus $\mathbf{4} < |A|$. If $\mathbf{4} = 1$ then A is an arc of C^+ otherwise by contradiction suppose that $1 < \mathbf{4} < |A|$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{5}$ such that $A_{\mathbf{4}} = W'_{\mathbf{5}}$. Since A is a subgraph of G_1^+ then $\mathbf{5} < 0$ and then the width of $A_{[\mathbf{4},|A|]}$ is strictly greater than p. Then, by lemma 5.2, $A_{[\mathbf{4},|A|]}$ intersect with $A_{[\mathbf{4},|A|]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ which contradicts the fact that A is a good path. Then A is an arc of C^+. Now if A is not extremum then let A' be the extremum arc extracted from A. Similarly to the previous reasoning, the width of A' is strictly greater than p. Thus, arcs A' and $A' + \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect which is a contradiction. Thus A is an extremum positive arc of C^+. Now, consider a decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of A in elementary arcs in C^+ and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of W'. Then by lemma 5.30, there exists $0 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{6} \leq p$ such that

$A = W'_{[0,\mathbf{5}]} \cdot_{1\leq i\leq \ell-1} (A^i \cdot D^i) \cdot A^\ell \cdot W'_{[\mathbf{6},p]}$. Also remark that $W'_{[0,\mathbf{5}]}$ and $W'_{[\mathbf{6},p]}$ are subpath of C and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the dual segment D^i is a subpath of C. Remark that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the path A^i is an arc of G_1^+.

Shrinking an arc: Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, if for all $k \geq 0$ the path $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+ then let $B^i = A^i$. Otherwise, there exists $k > 0$ such that $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is not an elementary arc of G_1^+ then remark that $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v} \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{A^i_1 + k\overrightarrow{v}, A^i_{|A^i|} + k\overrightarrow{v}\}$ then $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is a basic path of G_1^+ which ends in $A^i_{|A^i|} + k\overrightarrow{v}$. Then by applying lemma 5.31 on the basic path $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ of G_1^+, there exists a basic arc B^i of G_1^+ such that the restrained interior $B^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of the restrained interior of $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$, such that $B^i_1 = A^i_1$, such that $B^i_{|B^i|} = A^i_{|A^i|}$ and such that $V(B^i + k\overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W_{[\mathbf{1}+1,+\infty]}) \neq \emptyset$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{2}} \in B^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ and since $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and since $B^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of the restrained interior of $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ then $y_{W_{\mathbf{2}}} \geq \min\{y_C, y_Q\} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. Also, B^i is a subgraph of the restrained interior of A^i which is a subgraph of G_1^+, then B is a subgraph of G_1^+. Remark that the number of edges of the restrained graph of B^i is strictly less than the number of edges in the restrained graph of A^i. By iterating this reasoning we can suppose for all $k \geq 0$, the arc $B^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+.

Iterating for all arcs: by doing the same reasoning for all elementary arcs, we obtain that a path $R = W'_{[0,\mathbf{5}]} \cdot_{1\leq i\leq \ell-1} (B^i \cdot D^i) \cdot B^\ell \cdot W'_{[\mathbf{6},p]}$. Now since for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and for all $k \geq 0$, the arc $B^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of the restrained interior of $A^i + k\overrightarrow{v}$ and since A is a good path, then R is a good path. Moreover $R^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+. Now if $R = Q$ then $Q^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of G_1^+. Otherwise, there exists $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{3} \geq |R|$ such that $R^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{3}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and such that $y_{W_{\mathbf{2}}} \geq \min\{y_C, y_Q\} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. □

6 Modified window lemma and jailed path assembly

In this part, we modify a previous result known as the window movie lemma [16]. The previous result is general but not powerful enough for our study. We modify it in order to be more powerful but less general and we give two applications of this modified window movie lemma. One is about thin path assembly which will be later use to prove the stakes lemma. The second one is the proof of the jail lemma, one of the fourth macroscopic lemmas of our toolbox. In this section, we will cut the grid with discrete line and only this kind of cut will be used. The figures of this section are in Appendix E.

6.1 Output glues, movies, stripes and window movie lemma

First, we adapt the window movie lemma [16] to our notations. Note that, all of the notations introduced in this section are specific to this section and are not used in other parts of the article. Here, we will cut the grid with several lines to partition the set of vertices of the grid (see figure 74). Consider a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the height function associated to $\overrightarrow{v}$, let $p = x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. For all $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, let (D^h, U^h) be the cut by the line of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and height hp and let L^h be its window. Remark that the set of vertices of all these windows is a partition of $V(G)$, *i.e.* $V(G) = \bigcup_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}(V(L^h))$ and for all $h, h' \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h \neq h'$, we have $V(L^h) \cap V(L^{h'}) = \emptyset$. Note that this property is not true for the edges of $E(G)$, $E(G) \neq \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}(E(L^h))$. Indeed, there exists two kinds of edges of $E(G)$: the ones where there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that they belong to $E(L^h)$

and the ones where there exists $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that one extremity in $E(L^h)$ and the other extremity is in $E(L^{h+1})$ (see figure 74). The window movie lemma focusses on the edges of the second kind. For a given $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, we will consider all the edges of a path P with an extremity in L^h and the other one in L^{h+1}. Before pursuing, remark that since the last section, we have worked on path. Now, we need to work again on path assembly. To achieve this goal, we introduce output glues. Intuitively, an output glue of a path assembly is an edge of its underlying path labeled by a type of glue.

Consider a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, an *output glue* is a couple (g, e) where $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is a glue and $e \in E(G)$ is an oriented edge of the grid. Intuitively, an output glue is the glue linking two adjacent tiles positioned on the grid. We define by $\text{type}((g,e)) = g$ and $edge((g,e)) = e$. Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T}$. For all $1 \leq i \leq |P| - 1$, the *output glue* g_i of P is the output glue where $\text{type}(g_i)$ is the type of the glue on the abuttal side of P_i and P_{i+1} and $edge(g_i) = (\text{pos}(P_i), \text{pos}(P_{i+1}))$. Remark that the edge of an output glue is an edge of the binding graph of P. Similarly to previous definitions, the translation of an output glue (g, e) by a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ is $(g, e + \overrightarrow{w})$.

Now, we define the movie of a path assembly P. Intuitively a movie of heigh h contains all the output glues of P which have on extremity in L^h and the other one in L^{h+1}. The *movie* $\mathcal{M}$ of path assembly P of height h and direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ is the sequence $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{M}|}$ of output glues such that (see Figure 75):

- for all $1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{M}|$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq |P| - 1$ such that $g_j = \mathcal{M}_i$ and either $P_j \in L^h$ and $P_{j+1} \in L^{h+1}$ or $P_j \in L^{h+1}$ and $P_{j+1} \in L^h$;
- for all $1 \leq j \leq |P| - 1$ such that either $P_j \in L^h$ and $P_{j+1} \in L^{h+1}$ or $P_j \in L^{h+1}$ and $P_{j+1} \in L^h$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{M}|$ such $\mathcal{M}_i = g_j$;
- if $1 \leq i < j \leq |\mathcal{M}|$ and $\mathcal{M}_i = g_{i'}$ and $\mathcal{M}_j = g_{j'}$ then $i' < j'$.

The translation of a movie by a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ is obtained by translating all output glues of $\mathcal{M}$ by $\overrightarrow{w}$ and keeping the same order. The movie $\mathcal{M}$ is identical to the movie $\mathcal{M}'$ up to translation if only if there exists a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ such that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}' + \overrightarrow{w}$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(h, \overrightarrow{v})$ the movie of P according to the cut (D^h, U^h) of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. Remark that for an output glue g of P and for a given non-null vector $\overrightarrow{v}$, there is at most one h such that g is an output glue of $\mathcal{M}(h, \overrightarrow{v})$.

For a path assembly P and a subgraph Q of G, we define $\alpha_{(P,Q)}$ as the function whose domain is $V(Q) \cap \text{dom}(P)$ for all $(x, y) \in V(Q) \cap \text{dom}(P)$, $\alpha_{(P,Q)}(x, y) = \text{type}(P_i)$ where $\text{pos}(P_i) = (x, y)$. With this definition, for all $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\alpha_P = \alpha_{(P,U^{h+1})} \cup \alpha_{(P,D^h)}$ (see figure 75). Note that the function $\alpha_{(P,Q)}$ is not necessary an assembly because its domain may not be connected. Now, we can state the window movie lemma [16] applied to our setting. Note that, this result is a special case of the window movie lemma which is more general. For an illustration of the following lemma, see Figures 80 and 81 of appendix E.1.

Lemma 6.1. *Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, two integers $h, h' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h' > h$ and two non empty movies $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of P. If there exists a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ such that $\mathcal{M}'$ is equal to $\mathcal{M} + \overrightarrow{w}$ and if $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(D^h)$ (resp. $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(U^{h'+1})$) then $\alpha_{(P,D^{h'})} \cup (\alpha_{(P,U^{h+1})} + \overrightarrow{w})$ (resp. $(\alpha_{(P,D^{h'})} - \overrightarrow{w}) \cup \alpha_{(P,U^{h+1})}$) is an assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$.*

Note that the definition of $\overrightarrow{w}$ implies that $\overrightarrow{w}$ is non-null and that $U^{h+1} + \overrightarrow{w} = U^{h'+1}$. Thus the movies $\mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of P are identical to the movies $\mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of the assembly built by the window movie lemma. Thus it is possible to apply the window movie lemma again to obtain this more general result (see Figure 80, Figure 82 and Figure 83 of appendix E.1).

Corollary 6.2. *Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, two integers $h, h' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h' > h$ and two non empty movies $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of P. Suppose that there exists a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ such that $\mathcal{M}'$ is equal to $\mathcal{M} + \overrightarrow{w}$ and that $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(D^h)$ (resp. $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(U^{h'+1})$). We define the infinite sequence $(P^{*i})_{0 \leq i}$ as $P^{*0} = P$ and for all $i \geq 0$, $P^{*(i+1)} = \alpha_{(P^{*i}, D^{h'})} \cup (P^{*(i+1)} = \alpha_{(P^{*i}, U^{h+1})} + \overrightarrow{w})$ (resp. $(\alpha_{(P^{*i}, D^{h'})} - \overrightarrow{w}) \cup \alpha_{(P^{*i}, U^{h+1})}$). Then for all $i > 0$, P^{*i} is an assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$.*

As previously mentioned, we have $U^{h+1} + \overrightarrow{w} = U^{h'+1}$. Now, since $h' > h$ then $U^{h'+1}$ is a subgraph of U^{h+1} and then a simple recurrence leads to the fact that any segment of P which is a subgraph of U^{h+1} appears translated by $i\overrightarrow{w}$ in P^{*i} for all $i \geq 0$ (see Figures 84, 85 and 86 of appendix E.1).

Fact 6.3. Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, two integers $h, h' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h' > h$ and two non empty movies $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of P. Suppose that there exists a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ such that $\mathcal{M}'$ is equal to $\mathcal{M} + \overrightarrow{w}$ and that $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(D^h)$ (resp. $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(U^{h'+1})$). Consider the infinite sequence of assemblies $(P^{*i})_{0 \leq i}$ obtained by lemma 6.2. Consider $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that the underlying path of $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]})$ is a subgraph of U^{h+1} (resp. $D^{h'}$) then for all $i \geq 0$, $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + i\overrightarrow{w}$ (resp. $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} - i\overrightarrow{w}$) is a subassembly of P^{*i}.

6.2 The modified window movie lemma

Now we present an original result, We show that in our setting, a path assembly P is in fact pumpable or fragile if two identical movies of P can be found.

Lemma 6.4. *Consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, two integers $h, h' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h' > h$ and two non empty movies $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of P. If there exists a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ such that $\mathcal{M}'$ is equal to $\mathcal{M} + \overrightarrow{w}$ and if $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset D^h$ or $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset U^{h'+1}$ then P is pumpable or fragile.*

Proof. See Figures 84 and 87 of appendix E.1 for a graphical representation of this proof. Since $V(S) \cap \text{dom}(\sigma) = \emptyset$ and since the seed is connected then we can assume without loss of generality that $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(D^h)$. We start by localizing a candidate segment of the path assembly P of direction $\overrightarrow{w}$ which is a subgraph of D^{h+1}. Then using fact 6.3, we prove that either this segment is pumpable or that the path assembly P is fragile. Note that this is the only time in this article that we will try to pump a candidate segment which is not necessarily a good candidate segment.

We start by proving the existence of indices $1 \leq k \leq |\mathcal{M}|$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that:

- there is no tile of the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ positioned in D^h, *i.e.* $(\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(D^h) = \emptyset)$;
- the output glue of $P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ is $\mathcal{M}_k$;

- the output glue of $P_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ is $\mathcal{M}'_k$.

Consider the following invariant $I(k)$="there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that the output glue $g_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}_k$ and the output glue $g_{\mathbf{2}}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}'_k$". First, we prove that $H(1)$ is true. By hypothesis, the domain of the seed is in D^h, *i.e.* $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(D^h)$ and thus $h(\text{pos}(P_1)) < (h+1)p < (h'+1)p$. Since the movies $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are not empty, consider the first index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that the height of $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is greater than $(h+1)p$ then the output glue $g_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}_1$. Similarly, consider the first index $\mathbf{2}$ such that the height of $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ is greater than $(h'+1)p$ then the output glue $g_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}'_1$. Moreover $h(P_{\mathbf{2}-1}) \geq (h'+1)p - \max(x_{\overrightarrow{v}}, y_{\overrightarrow{v}}) > (h+1)p$ and thus we have $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}-1 < \mathbf{2}$ and $I(1)$ is true. Now, suppose that $I(k)$ is true for $1 \leq k \leq |\mathcal{M}|-1$. Then, there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that the output glue $g_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}_k$ and the output glue $g_{\mathbf{2}}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}'_k$. Two cases can occur: either $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(D^h) = \emptyset$ and the desired indices $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}$ and k have been found or $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ contains tiles positioned in D^h. In the second case, there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3} < \mathbf{2}$ such that $h(P_{\mathbf{3}}) < (h+1)p$ and since the output glue of $P_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ is $\mathcal{M}'_k$ then either $h(P_{\mathbf{2}}) > (h'+1)p > (h+1)p$ or $h(P_{\mathbf{2}-1}) > (h'+1)p > (h+1)p$, then there $k' > k$ and $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4} \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that the output glue $g_{\mathbf{4}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}_{k'}$. By definition of a movie there exists $\mathbf{5} > \mathbf{4}$ such that the output glue of $P_{\mathbf{5}-1}$ is $\mathcal{M}'_{k'}$ and this means that $I(k')$ is true. Thus either we have found the desired index k or $I(k')$ is true with $k' > k$. If $I(|\mathcal{M}|)$ is true then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that the output glue $g_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}_{|\mathcal{M}|}$ and the output glue $g_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ of P is $\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{M}|}$. If $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ contains positions of D^h, then $\mathcal{M}_{|\mathcal{M}|}$ could not be the last output glue of the movie which is a contradiction. Thus, the domain of the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ cannot contain a vertex of D^h and the desired indices $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}$ and $k = |M|$ have been found. Thus in all cases, there exist $1 \leq k \leq |\mathcal{M}|$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that the output glue of $P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ is $\mathcal{M}_k$, the output glue of $P_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ is $\mathcal{M}'_k$ and $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(D^{h-1}) = \emptyset$.

Moreover, since $\mathcal{M}'_k = \mathcal{M}_k + \overrightarrow{w}$ and since the edges of the output glue are oriented then the direction of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is $\overrightarrow{w}$. Now, remark that the path assembly Q such that $Q_{[1,|Q|-1]} = P_{[1,\mathbf{2}-1]}$ and $Q_{|Q|} = P_{\mathbf{1}} + \overrightarrow{w}$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$. Thus if $\text{type}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \neq \text{type}(P_{\mathbf{1}})$ then P is fragile. Then either P is fragile or $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of P of direction $\overrightarrow{w}$. If this candidate segment is pumpable then the lemma is true. Otherwise by lemma 2.12, there exists $j > 0$ such that there exists a conflict between either $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + j\overrightarrow{w}$ and σ or between $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + j\overrightarrow{w}$ and $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$. Now consider the sequence of assemblies $(P^{*i})_{i\geq 0}$ created by the window movie lemma (Lemma 6.2). Then these assemblies are producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and by fact 6.3, $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + j\overrightarrow{w}$ is a subassembly of P^{*j}. Then P and P^{*j} are in conflict. Thus the path assembly P is fragile in this final case.

□

To use this modified windows movie lemma, we need two identical movies up to translation. To achieve this goal, we will just consider a lot of different movies until we find two identical ones. The following result is a more practical setting of the modified windows movie lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *Consider a finite path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Let $p = x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ and suppose that:*

- *for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, the width of the binding graph α_P for window L^i is bounded by c;*
- $|P| \geq 4cp(2c!)(2|T|+1)^{2c} + 2c|\sigma|$;

then P is pumpable or fragile.

Proof. Consider the window L^0 and an indexing of L^0 such that for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $L^0_{i+p} = L^0_i + \overrightarrow{v}$, we will use this window and this indexing as a reference to compare different movies. Now, consider $h, h' \in \mathbb{Z}$, the two windows L^h and $L^{h'}$ and the two non-empty movies $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}(\overrightarrow{v}, h')$ of P. There exist a vector $\overrightarrow{w}$ (resp. $\overrightarrow{w}'$) and an indexing of L^h (resp. $L^{h'}$) such that $L^0 + \overrightarrow{w} = L^h$ (resp. $L^0 + \overrightarrow{w}' = L^{h'}$), such that $L^0_0 + \overrightarrow{w} = L^h_0$ (resp. $L^0_0 + \overrightarrow{w} = L^{h'}_0$) and such that $0 \leq \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : L^h_i \in \mathrm{dom}(P)\} < p$ (resp. $0 \leq \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : L^{h'}_i \in \mathrm{dom}(P)\} < p$); this fact is due to the periodicity of L^h and $L^{h'}$, see Figure 76. If $\mathcal{M}^h - \overrightarrow{w} = \mathcal{M}^{h'} - \overrightarrow{w}'$ then these two movies are identical up to translation. Now, we enumerate the number of possible different movies. First, $\min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : L^h_i \in \mathrm{dom}(P)\}$ can take p different values. Since for all windows, the width of α_P is bounded by c then there exists at most c tiles of P positioned on the window L^h. Any of these tiles can belong to at most two output glues of the movie $\mathcal{M}^h$. Then the size of all movies is bounded by $2c$. Now, there exists $(2c!)$ possible ways to order these $2c$ output glues. For each of this ordering there exists $(2|T| + 1)^{2c}$ ways to color it (for this enumeration we consider the absence of an output glue has a type of glue and there is at most $|T|$ types of glues multiplied by two for the orientation of the edge). Then, there exists at most $p(2c!)(2|T| + 1)^{2c}$ different movies up to translation. Now, there exists three kind of movies: the movies which contains output glues of the seed, the movies of height h such that the domain of the seed is a subgraph of D^h and the movies of height h such that the domain of the seed is a subgraph of U^{h+1}. There exists at most $|\sigma|$ movies of the first kind. Since the length of the movies is bounded by $2c$ and since $|P| \geq 4cp(2c!)(2|T| + 1)^{2c} + 2c|\sigma|$ then there exists at least $2p(2c!)(2|T| + 1)^{2c}$ non-empty movies of the second or $2p(2c!)(2|T| + 1)^{2c}$ non-empty movies of the third kind. Then, either there exists at least two movies of the second kind which are identical up to translation or there exists two movies of the third kind which are identical up to translation. Then by lemma 6.4, the path assembly P is fragile or pumpable. □

6.3 Application of the modified window movie lemma

Thin path. Before proving the jail lemma and concluding this section. We present a direct application of the modified window movie lemma to thin path assembly. Intuitively a thin path assembly, is a path assembly whose length is far greater than its width. Such a path assembly is fragile or pumpable by the modified windows movie lemma. This result is a good illustration on how to use this lemma and will be useful to prove the stakes lemma in section 8.

Definition 6.6 (Thin path assembly)**.** Consider a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, let $f^b : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be the function $f^b(x) = 4x(2x!)(2|T| + 1)^{2x} + 2x|\sigma|$. A path assembly P is thin if and only if $Y_P - y_P > f^b(X_P - x_P)$ or $X_P - x_P > f^b(Y_P - y_P)$.

Lemma 6.7. *If a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ is thin then it is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $Y_P - y_P > f^b(X_P - x_P)$. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = (1, 0)$ and then by definition of thin path assembly for all $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, the width of P for window L^h of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ is bounded by $X_P - x_P$. Since $|P| \geq Y_P - y_P \geq f^b(X_P - x_P)$ and then by lemma 6.5, P is pumpable or fragile. □

Jail lemma. Consider a path P, a vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that P and $P - \overrightarrow{v}$ does not intersect and let $p = x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. Then consider a cut (U, D) of the grid by a discrete line of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and its window L. First we prove that the width of P according to L is bounded by $2p^2 + 2p$. This result and the lemma 6.5 lead to the jail lemma. Bounding the width of P is not an easy task. Here is a quick sketch of the proof. In the previous section, we have shown that if there exists an arc of width greater than p which is a subgraph of P then P and $P - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect (lemma 5.3). Then, Figure 77 shows what we conjecture to be the worst case scenario. In this case, consider a decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of P into extremum arcs. From this decomposition, we can extract a sequence of arc $(B^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell'}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell' - 1$ the arc B^i is dominated by B^{i+1} (lemma 6.8). This result implies that the widths of the arcs of this sequence increase by at least two each time, *i.e.* for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell' - 1$ the width of B^{i+1} is at least the width of B^i plus 2. Then if this sequence contains more than $\frac{p}{2}$ arcs, it also contains an arc of width greater than p. By the previous lemma, P and $P - \overrightarrow{v}$ intersect in this case. These results provides a bound of $2p^2 + 2p$ for the width of P according to window L.

Lemma 6.8. *Consider a path P, a non null vector $\overrightarrow{v}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and a cut (U, D) of the grid by a line of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and its window L. Let $p = x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. Suppose that P and $P - \overrightarrow{v}$ does not intersect, then the width of P according to the window L is bounded by $2p^2 + 2p$.*

Proof. By contradiction, suppose that the width of P is strictly greater than $2p^2 + 2p$. First, we show that without loss of generality we can consider that P is an extremum finite path. Remark that if the width of P is infinite, then it is possible to find a finite subpath of P such that its width is strictly greater than $2p^2 + 2p$. Then, without loss of generality, we can suppose that P is finite and such is its width. Now, consider an index of L such that $0 = \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : L_i \in V(P)\}$ and let $m = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : L_i \in V(P)\}$ then the width of P is $m > 2p^2 + 2p$. Now, consider the extremum path extracted from P, this path is extremum and its width is m. Then, we can assume without loss of generality that P is an extremum finite path of width strictly greater than $2p^2 + 2p$.

Let $Q = P - \overrightarrow{v}$ be the path P translated by $-\overrightarrow{v}$. Our aim is to prove that P and Q intersect. The path Q starts in $L_{-p} = Q_1$ and ends in $L_{m-p} = Q_{|Q|}$. This proof will require to define eight indices. Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of P in extremum arcs in U and let $(S^i)_{0 \leq i \leq \ell}$ be the decomposition of the window L according to $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ and its dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0 \leq i \leq \ell}$. Let $e = \max\{0 \leq i \leq \ell : \text{there exists } 1 \leq j \leq |Q| \text{ such that } Q_j \in V(D^i)\}$ (e is correctly defined since $Q_0 \in V(D^0)$). Let $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |Q|$ be such that $\mathbf{1} = \min\{1 \leq i \leq |Q| : Q_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(D^e)\}$ and let $\mathbf{2}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{2}} = Q_{\mathbf{1}}$. Now two cases may occur either $\mathbf{2} > p^2 + p$ or $\mathbf{2} \leq p^2 + p$.

First case ($\mathbf{2} > p^2 + p$): see Figure 78 for a graphical representation of this case. Let $Q' = Q_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ and let $(B^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell'}$ be the decomposition of Q' in extremum arcs in U. Since $Q \cap W_{[m,+\infty]} = \emptyset$ then by lemma 5.11 either P and Q' intersect or for all $1 \leq i \leq e$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell'$ such that arc B^j dominates arc A^i. Now, note that for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell'$, the arc $B^i + \overrightarrow{v}$ is an arc of U and a subgraph of P and then there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that either $A^j = B^i + \overrightarrow{v}$ or A^j dominates $B^i + \overrightarrow{v}$. Now, we define a sequence of arcs $(C^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell''}$ of U such that $C^1 = A^1$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell''$, if there exists $0 \leq j \leq \ell'$ such that B^j dominates C^i then the arc C^{i+1} is defined as the arc $A^{j'}$ such that either $A^{j'} = B^j + \overrightarrow{v}$ or $A^{j'}$ dominates $B^j + \overrightarrow{v}$; if there exists no $0 \leq j \leq \ell'$ such that B^j dominates C^i then $i = \ell''$ and C^i is the last arc of the sequence. Let $\mathbf{3} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $C^{\ell''}$ ends in $L_{\mathbf{3}}$ then $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{2}$ otherwise the arc $C^{\ell''}$ would be dominated by an arc

of $(B^j)_{1\leq j\leq \ell'}$. Then, for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell''$, the arc C^i is a subgraph of P and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell'' - 1$ the arc $C^{i+1} - \overrightarrow{v}$ dominates C^i. For all $1 \leq i \leq \ell''$, let w_i be the width of arc C^i.

Now, we prove by recurrence that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell''$, the hypothesis $H(i)$: " $w_i \geq 2(i-1)$. Moreover for all $0 \leq j < i$, we have $w_i \geq w_j$ and there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that C^i ends in L_k with $k \leq i(w_i) + (i-1)p$". The arc C^1 is the arc A^1 which starts in L_0 and $w_1 \geq 0$ and C^1 ends in L_{w_1}. Thus the initialization of the recurrence is done. Now, suppose that $H(i)$ is true for $1 \leq i \leq \ell'' - 1$, then C^i is dominated by $C^{i+1} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then there exists $\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}, \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{7} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that C^i starts in $L_{\mathbf{4}}$ and ends in $L_{\mathbf{5}}$ and C^{i+1} starts in $L_{\mathbf{6}}$ and ends in $L_{\mathbf{7}}$ with $\mathbf{6} - p < \mathbf{4} \leq \mathbf{5} < \mathbf{7} - p$. This means that $\mathbf{7} - \mathbf{6} \geq \mathbf{5} - \mathbf{4} + 2 \geq w_i + 2 \geq 2i$. Moreover, by recurrence we have that for all $1 \leq j \leq i$, $w_{i+1} > w_i \geq w_j$. By recurrence, we have $\mathbf{5} \leq i(w_i) + (i-1)p$. Moreover $\mathbf{7} = \mathbf{6} + w_{i+1}$ and $\mathbf{6} - p < \mathbf{5}$ then $\mathbf{7} \leq i(w_i) + (i-1)p + w_{i+1} + p \leq (i+1)(w_{i+1}) + ip$ and the recurrence is true. Now, if $\ell'' \geq \frac{p}{2} + 1$ then $w_{\ell''} \geq p$ and by lemma 5.3, P and Q intersect. Otherwise, suppose that $\ell'' \leq \frac{p}{2}$ and $w_{\ell''} < p$ then $C^{\ell'}$ ends in $L_{\mathbf{3}}$ with $\mathbf{3} < p^2 + p$ which is a contradiction.

Second case ($\mathbf{2} \leq p^2 + p$): see Figure 79 for a graphical representation of this case. Since $Q = P - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the decomposition of Q in extremum arcs in U is $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ with for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, $B^i = A^i - \overrightarrow{v}$. Consider $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that B^i starts in $W_{\mathbf{8}}$ with $\mathbf{8} > \mathbf{2}$ then there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that $W_{\mathbf{8}} \in S^j$ (otherwise this would contradicts the definition of e) then either A^j and B^i intersect or A^j dominates B^i. Now, we define a sequence of arcs $(C^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell'}$ of U such that $C^1 = A^\ell$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$, if there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that A^j dominates $C^i - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the arc C^{i+1} is defined as the arc A^j; if there exists no $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that C^j dominates $C^i - \overrightarrow{v}$ then $i = \ell'$ and C^i is the last arc of the sequence. Let $\mathbf{3} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $C^{\ell'}$ starts in $L_{\mathbf{3}}$ then $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{2} + p$ otherwise the arc $C^1 - \overrightarrow{v}$ would be dominated by an arc of $(A^j)_{1\leq j\leq \ell'}$. Then, for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$, the arc C^i is a subgraph of P and for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell' - 1$ the arc C^{i+1} dominates $C^i - \overrightarrow{v}$. For all $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$, let w_i be the width of arc C^i.

Now, we prove by recurrence that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$, the hypothesis $H(i)$: " $w_i \geq 2(i-1)$. Moreover for all $1 \leq j \leq i$, we have $w_i \geq w_j$ and there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that C^i starts in L_k with $k \geq m - (i(w_i) + (i-1)p)$". The arc C^1 is the arc A^ℓ which ends in W_m and thus C^1 starts in $W_{m-w_{\ell'}}$. Thus the initialization of the recurrence is done. Now, suppose that $H(i)$ is true for $1 \leq i \leq \ell' - 1$, then $C^i - \overrightarrow{v}$ is dominated by C^{i+1}. Then there exists $\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}, \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{7} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that C^i starts in $L_{\mathbf{4}}$ and ends in $L_{\mathbf{5}}$ and C^{i+1} starts in $L_{\mathbf{6}}$ and ends in $L_{\mathbf{7}}$ with $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{4} - p \leq \mathbf{5} - p < \mathbf{7}$. This means that $\mathbf{7} - \mathbf{6} \geq \mathbf{5} - \mathbf{4} + 2 \geq w_i + 2 \geq 2i$. Moreover, by recurrence we have that for all $1 \leq i \leq j$, $w_{i+1} > w_i \geq w_j$. By recurrence, we have $\mathbf{4} \geq m - (i(w_i) + (i-1)p)$. Moreover $\mathbf{6} = \mathbf{7} - w_{i+1}$ and $\mathbf{7} > \mathbf{4} - p$ then $\mathbf{6} \geq m - (i(w_i) + (i-1)p) - w_{i+1} - p \geq m - ((i+1)(w_{i+1}) + ip)$ and the recurrence is true. Now, if $\ell' \geq \frac{p}{2} + 1$ then $w_1 \geq p$ and by lemma 5.3, P and Q intersect. Otherwise, suppose that $\ell' \leq \frac{p}{2}$ and $w_{\ell'} < p$ then C^1 starts in $L_{\mathbf{3}}$ with $\mathbf{3} > m - p^2 \geq \mathbf{2} + p$ which is a contradiction.

□

We can now prove the jail lemma.

Lemma 6.9 (Jail lemma)**.** *Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$. If the path assembly P is jailed at index $\mathbf{1}$ then it is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. By the definition of the jail constraints, there exists ℓ such that $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^j(\ell))$. Then the length of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is at least

$f^j(\ell) - \ell > 4(\mathcal{B}^2(2\mathcal{B}+1))(2(2\mathcal{B}^2+\mathcal{B}))!)(2|T|+1)^{2\mathcal{B}^2+\mathcal{B}} + \mathcal{B}\ell^2$ (see appendix A for the definition of f^j). By definition of the jail constraints $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ and $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ then $|\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \cup \mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]})| \leq \ell^2$. Now, let $\sigma' = \sigma \cup \alpha_{P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}}$ then $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is producible by the tiling system $(T, \sigma', 1)$. Moreover by definition of the jail constraints, $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$ and then by lemma 6.8 and 6.5, the path $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is pumpable or fragile. Then P is fragile or pumpable. □

7 Microscopic reasoning

In this section, we give definitions and prove results necessary to obtain the three remaining macroscopic lemmas. Proofs of these macroscopic lemmas is left for the next final section. We start by a roadmap of the last part of the proof. The figures of this section are in Appendix F.

7.1 Roadmap of the microscopic reasoning

In fact, our final aim is to prove the stakes lemma. The seed lemma and the reset lemma will be proven along the way. The main idea of the stakes lemma is simple, consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. Finding a candidate segment of P is easy since a segment of P of length at least $|T| + 1$ always contains two tiles of the same type. Then, consider $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of P. Now, we can try to build two path assemblies, one by removing the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$, *i.e.* $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ and the other one by pumping the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ one time, *i.e.* $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]} \cdot P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$. If these constructions are possible then the stakes lemma is true. Unfortunately, these two path assemblies does not always exist.

To solve this problem, we introduce *visible* candidate segment. As we will see in the next section, visible candidate segments of P are also easy to find and allow us to find an infinite zone (called the *free* zone) of the grid where we can try to build our stakes without fearing intersection with the seed or the beginning of the path assembly P. Then, from a visible candidate segment, we built the stakes in two steps. In the first step, we construct forks which share some characteristic with stakes but not all of them and then in the second step these forks are refined into stakes. Here lies the main particularity of the proof. Building the forks is not particularly difficult but refining them into stakes is hard. In particular, the refining process requires the three other macroscopic lemmas. Note that the jail lemma has already been proven in the previous section. To prove the other two lemmas, we need another result which is that a path assembly making a U-turn is fragile or pumpable and in order to prove this result, we need forks.

To summarize the previous paragraph, after defining visible candidate segments, we give a method to build forks. This method is the first half of the method to build stakes. Then, we use these forks to prove a lemma about U-turn. In the following section, we use U-turn to prove the seed lemma and the reset lemma. Finally, the proof can now be concluded by giving the second half of the method to build stakes from forks.

7.2 Visible tiles

In this part, we introduce visible tiles and visible candidate segments and we prove some fundamental properties about them. Consider a simple path assembly P producible by a tiling

system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$, then the tile $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is *visible from the west* (resp. east) if and only if there exists no $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $x_{P_{\mathbf{2}}} < x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$ (resp. $x_{P_{\mathbf{2}}} > x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$) and $y_{\mathbf{2}} = y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$ (see Figure 88). Intuitively, a tile is visible from the west if and only if no tile of P occupies a position west of its. Moreover a visible tile $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ of P is *hidden* by the seed if and only if there exists $(x, y) \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$ such that $x < x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$ (resp. $x > x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$) and $y = y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{V}^P$ the set of indices of P such that the corresponding tile is visible from the west, *i.e.* $\mathcal{V}^P \subset \{1, \ldots, |P|\}$ and for all $i \in \mathcal{V}^P$, P_i is visible from the west. We denote by $\mathcal{V}^P_\sigma$ the set of indices of P such that the corresponding tile is visible from the west and not hidden by the seed. Similarly, a position $(x, y) \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$ which belongs to the domain of the seed σ is *visible from the west* if and only if there exists no $(x', y') \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \cup \mathrm{dom}(P)$ such that $x' < x$ and $y' = y$. We denote by $\mathcal{V}^\sigma$ the set of positions which belong to the domain of the seed and which are visible from the west. Note that $|\mathcal{V}^\sigma| \leq |\sigma|$ and remark that if $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is hidden by the seed then there exists $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}^\sigma$ such that $y_{P_{\mathbf{i}}} = y$. Also, at most $|\mathcal{V}^\sigma|$ visible tiles are hidden by the seed. Since the binding graph of P is connected, for all $y_P \leq h \leq Y_P$, there exists a unique tile visible from the west of ordinate h. This remark is formalized in the following fact.

Fact 7.1. Consider an simple path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ then for all $y_P \leq h \leq Y_P$, there exists a unique index $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ such that $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} = h$. Then, we have $|\mathcal{V}^P| = Y_P - y_P + 1$ and $|\mathcal{V}^P_\sigma| \geq Y_P - y_P - |\sigma| + 1$.

Visibility from the west or from the east impose some global constraints on the path assembly P and some local constraints around a tile P_i with $i \in \mathcal{V}^P$. This combination of constraints will lead to powerful results. We start by studying the local constraints. consider $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ then $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is *directed to the north* (resp. to the south) if and only if $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} + 1)$ (resp. $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} + 1)$) or $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} - 1)$ (resp. $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} - 1)$). Two remarks, first a tile cannot be directed to the north and to the south at the same time. Secondly, a tile is not necessary oriented to the north or to the south. Now, consider $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < |P|$ then a tile $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ exits to the north if $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} + 1)$, to the south if $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} - 1)$, to the east if $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} + 1, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}})$ and to the west if $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} - 1, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}})$. Remark that if $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$, there exists eight kinds of tiles (exiting to north implies directed to the north) but if the tile $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is visible from the west then there are only four possibilities. Indeed, a position $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}})$ has four neighbors in $V(G)$ and if $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{V}^P$, then the position $(x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} - 1, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}})$ cannot be occupied by a tile of the path assembly P. Then if $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$, two of the three remaining neighbors of $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}})$ in $V(G)$ have to be occupied by the tiles $P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}+1}$. One of these two occupied positions is either $(x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} - 1)$ or $(x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} + 1)$. This reasoning is summarized in the following fact:

Fact 7.2. Consider a simple path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $i \in \mathcal{V}^P$ such that $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$. Then there exists $\mathbf{2} \in \{\mathbf{1} - 1, \mathbf{1} + 1\}$ such that either $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}} - 1)$ or $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) = (x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}} + 1)$.

The fact 7.2 implies that if $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$ and $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ then it is oriented to north or to the south. If $\mathbf{1} = 1$ or if $\mathbf{1} = |P|$ then the tile may not be oriented to the north or the south but this case is limited to at most two tiles in the path assembly. Finally we obtain four kinds of tile visible from the west (see Figure 89): directed to the north and exiting to the north, directed to the north and exiting to the east, directed to the south and exiting to the south, directed to the south and exiting to the east.

Now we study global constraints imposed by visible tiles. In this section, our reasonings will often require to cut the grid with a simple path whose extremities are visible (see section 5.1, we recall that C^+ is the left side of the cut and that C^- is the right side). Tiles visible from the west or from the east are effective to define such cuts of the grid. Indeed, consider $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ and such that $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ is either visible from east or from the west then it is possible to define a cut (C^+, C^-) such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ belongs to the window of this cut (see Figure 90). Now, if $P_{\mathbf{2}} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ then remark that a tile $P_{\mathbf{3}}$ such that $\min\{y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}}\} \leq y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} \leq \max\{y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}}\}$ has to belong to C^- to be visible from the east otherwise a tile of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ would hide $P_{\mathbf{3}}$. Similarly, a tile $P_{\mathbf{3}}$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \in V(C^+) \setminus \text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]})$ cannot be visible from the east, a tile of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ will always hide it. These two observations are summarized in the two following facts.

Fact 7.3. Consider a simple path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$. Consider the cut (C^+, C^-) defined by the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ whose extremities are both visible from the west. If there exists $\mathbf{3} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ such that $\min\{y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}}\} \leq y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} \leq \max\{y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}, y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}}\}$ then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \in C^+$.

Fact 7.4. Consider a simple path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$. Consider the cut (C^+, C^-) defined by the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ whose extremities are both visible from the west. If there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such that either $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{2}$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \in \mathcal{V}^P$ then $P_{\mathbf{3}}$ is not visible from the east.

Now, we adapt the definition of visibility to the segments of a path assembly P. Let $1 < \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} < |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of P, then $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is *visible from the west* if and only if both $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ are visible from the west. Moreover the visible candidate segment is *directed to the north* (resp. south) is both $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ are directed to the north (resp. south), the candidate segment *exits to the north* (resp. south) if both $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ exits to the north (resp. south), the candidate segment *exits to the east* if both $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ exits to the east and the candidate segment is not hidden by the seed if both $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ are not hidden by the seed. Note that, we define all these notations for segments visible from the west. Same definitions could be done for the three other directions. Nevertheless, later we will use symmetry and rotation to modify the path assembly in order to consider only visibility from the west. In this section, we will consider mainly the same kind of candidate segment which is defined as follow: a *visible* candidate segment is a candidate segment which is visible from the west, not hidden by the seed, directed to the north and exits either by the east or the north. If we consider another kind of candidate segment, we will give the full list of hypothesis.

Now, we introduce *exposed* path assembly, we will show that the set of tiles visible from the west of such path assemblies can be easily described (Corollary 7.7 and Lemma 7.9) and that an exposed path assembly can be extracted from a path assembly without crucial information (Lemma 7.13). An exposed path assembly has to satisfy several hypothesis. Thus before defining them, we need some preliminary definitions. Consider a path assembly such that $Y_P > Y_\sigma$, the *first highest tile* of P is defined as P_t with $1 \leq t \leq |P|$ and $t = \min\{1 < i \leq |P| : y_{P_i} = Y_P\}$. Remark that if $Y_P > Y_\sigma$, then $1 < t$ and by a reasoning similar to the one done for fact 7.2, we have $\text{pos}(P_{t-1}) = (x_{P_t}, y_{P_t} - 1)$, *i.e.* the tile P_t is always directed to the north. Moreover, if $t < |P|$ then $y_{P_{t+1}} = y_{P_t}$ and either $x_{P_{t+1}} = x_{P_t} - 1$ (the tile P^t exits to the west) or $x_{P_{t+1}} = x_{P_t} + 1$, (the tile P^t exits to the east). If $t = |P|$, we consider that P^t exits to the east. Now, if the highest tile of P is directed to the east then the *tail* of P is *short* if

$y_{P_{[t,|P|]}} \geq \min\{y_{P_{[1,t]}}, y_\sigma\}$ otherwise the tail of P is *long*. If the path assembly P satisfies the following hypothesis then P is *exposed* (see Figure 88 for a example of exposed path and see Figure 91 for an example of a path assembly which is not exposed):

- path assembly P is finite and simple;
- $\mathrm{dom}(P) \cap \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) = \mathrm{pos}(P_1)$;
- $Y_P > Y_\sigma$;
- the highest tile of P exits to the east;
- the tail of P is short;
- $P_{|P|}$ is visible from the east and this visibility is not hidden by the seed.

If P is an exposed path assembly then the set $\mathcal{V}^P$ is rather simple to describe and we now prove a sequence of lemmas about this kind of path assembly. The aim of these lemmas can be summarized as follow (see Figure 89): there exists an integer ws called the watershed such that all tiles of P which are visible from the west and over this watershed are directed to the north, *i.e.* if $i \in \mathcal{V}^P$ and $y_{P_i} \geq ws$ then P_i is directed to the north. Similarly, all tiles of P which are visible from the west and under this watershed are directed to the south, *i.e.* if $i \in \mathcal{V}^P$ and $y_{P_i} < ws - 1$ then P_i is directed to the south. Moreover the farther a tile is from this watershed the more its index is great, *i.e.* let $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathcal{V}^P$, if $ws \leq y_{P_\mathbf{1}} \leq y_{P_\mathbf{2}}$ (resp. $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} \leq y_{P_\mathbf{2}} \leq ws$) then $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$ (resp. $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{1}$).

Lemma 7.5. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $1 < t \leq |P|$ such that P_t is the first highest tile of P then $\mathcal{V}_\sigma^P = \mathcal{V}_\sigma^{P_{[1,t]}}$.*

Proof. See Figure 92 for graphical representation of this proof. By the definition of an exposed path assembly, there exists a path Q such that Q is a subgraph of the binding graph of $P_{[1,t]} \cup \sigma$, such that $Q_{|Q|=P_t}$, $y_{Q_1} = \min\{y_P, y_\sigma\}$ and Q_1 is visible from the west in Q. Remark that by the definition of an exposed path assembly $y_\sigma < y_{P_t}$, then $|Q| > 1$. The graph Q is a path whose extremities are both visible from the west and then consider the cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid by the path Q whose extremities are both visible from the west. Let W be the window of this cut of the grid, let $m = |Q| - 1$ and consider an indexing of the window coherent with Q ($W_0 = \mathrm{pos}(Q_1)$ and $W_m = \mathrm{pos}(Q_{|Q|})$). By definition of an exposed path assembly, the output glue of P_t exits to the east and by the definition of t then $\mathrm{pos}(P_{t+1}) \notin V(C^+)$. Now, for the sake of contradiction suppose that $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[t+1,|P|]}) \cap V(C^+) \neq \emptyset$ then let $\mathbf{1} = \min\{i > t : \mathrm{pos}(P_i) \in C^+\}$ then there exists $\mathbf{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $W_\mathbf{2} = \mathrm{pos}(P_\mathbf{1})$. Now, if $\mathbf{2} < 0$ remark that the only neighboring position of $W_\mathbf{2}$ which does not belong to C^+ is $(x_{P_\mathbf{1}}, y_{P_\mathbf{1}} - 1)$ and then $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}}, y_{P_\mathbf{1}} - 1)$ which contradicts the fact that the tail of P is short. If $0 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq m$ then $P_{[1,t]}$ and $P_{[t+1,|P|]}$ intersect which contradicts the fact that P is simple. If $\mathbf{2} > m$ then $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}}, y_{P_\mathbf{1}} + 1)$ which contradicts the definition of t. Then, we have $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[t+1,|P|]}) \cap V(C^+) = \emptyset$. According to fact 7.3, no tile of $P_{[t+1,|P|]}$ is visible from the west in P, *i.e.* $\mathcal{V}_\sigma^P \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma^{P_{[1,t]}}$. Now consider $i \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma^{P_{[1,t]}}$, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the position $(x_{P_i} - k, y_{P_i})$ belongs to $V(C^+)$ (otherwise P_i would not be visible). Since $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[t+1,|P|]}) \cap V(C^+) = \emptyset$, then P_i is also visible in P and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma^{P_{[1,t]}} \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma^P$. □

As a corollary of this result the first highest tile of an exposed path assembly is visible from the west and is not hidden by the seed.

Corollary 7.6. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $1 < t \leq |P|$ such that P_t is the first highest tile of P then $t \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma^P$ and is directed to the north. Moreover P_t is visible from the east in $P_{[1,t]}$ (but maybe not in P) and this visibility is not hidden by the seed.*

Lemma 7.7. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, consider $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ such that $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} \leq y_{P_\mathbf{2}}$ (resp. $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} \geq y_{P_\mathbf{2}}$) and $P_\mathbf{1}$ is directed to the north (resp. south) then $P_\mathbf{2}$ is also directed to the north (resp. south).*

Proof. See Figure 93 for a graphical representation of this proof. We suppose that $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$, the other case is symmetric. Since $P_\mathbf{1}$ and $P_\mathbf{2}$ are visible from the west then both extremities of the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ are visible from the west. Consider the cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid by the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ whose extremities are both visible from the west and let W be its window. Since P is simple and since $P_\mathbf{1}$ and $P_\mathbf{2}$ is visible from the west then $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,|P|]}) \cap V(W) = \emptyset$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $P_\mathbf{1}$ is directed to the north and that $P_\mathbf{2}$ is directed to the south, then either $P_\mathbf{2}$ exits either to the south or to the east. If $P_\mathbf{2}$ exits to the south then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}+1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{2}}, y_{P_\mathbf{2}} - 1)$ and either $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{2}} + 1, y_{P_\mathbf{2}})$ or $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{2}}, y_{P_\mathbf{2}} + 1)$, in both cases $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}+1}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. If $P_\mathbf{2}$ exits to the east then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}+1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{2}} + 1, y_{P_\mathbf{2}})$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{2}}, y_{P_\mathbf{2}} + 1)$, in both cases $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}+1}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. Then in all cases the tile $P_{\mathbf{2}+1}$ is positioned in $V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$, *i.e.* $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}+1}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. Since P is a simple path assembly then $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,|P|]}) \subset V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. In this case $\text{pos}(P_{|P|}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$ and since $P_{|P|}$ is visible from the east by the definition of an exposed path assembly, then fact 7.4 leads to a contradiction.

□

Corollary 7.8. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, there exists a value $ws \in \mathbb{Z}$ called the* watershed *of P such that for all $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{V}^P$ if $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} \geq ws$ then $P_\mathbf{1}$ is directed to the north and if $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} < ws - 1$ then $P_\mathbf{1}$ is directed to the south.*

Note that we have the condition $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} < ws - 1$ because the the tile P_1 may be visible from the west and non-oriented.

Lemma 7.9. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathcal{V}^P$, if $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} \leq y_{P_\mathbf{2}}$ and $P_\mathbf{1}$ is directed to the north (resp. $P_\mathbf{2}$ is directed to the south) then $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$ (resp. $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{1}$).*

Proof. See Figure 94 for a graphical representation of the proof. We consider the case where $P_\mathbf{1}$ is directed to the north, the other case is symmetric. Suppose that $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} \geq y_{P_\mathbf{1}}$ then by lemma 7.7, $P_\mathbf{2}$ is also directed to the north. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$. Since $P_\mathbf{1}$ and $P_\mathbf{2}$ are visible from the west then both extremities of the segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]}$ are visible from the west. Consider the cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid by the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}]}$ whose extremities are both visible from the west. Since P is simple and since $P_\mathbf{1}$ and $P_\mathbf{2}$ is visible from the west then $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1}+1,|P|]}) \cap V(W) = \emptyset$. Now, either $P_\mathbf{1}$ exits to the north or to the east. If $P_\mathbf{1}$ exits to the north then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}}, y_{P_\mathbf{1}} + 1)$ and either $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}} + 1, y_{P_\mathbf{1}})$ or $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}}, y_{P_\mathbf{1}} - 1)$, in both cases $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) \in C^+$. If $P_\mathbf{1}$ exits to the east then

$\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}} + 1, y_{P_\mathbf{1}})$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) = (x_{P_\mathbf{1}}, y_{P_\mathbf{1}} - 1)$, in this case $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) \in C^+$. Then in both cases the tile $P_{\mathbf{1}+1}$ is positioned in C^+, *i.e.* $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}+1}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. Since P is a simple path assembly and $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2} \in \mathcal{V}^P$, then $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{1}+1,|P|]}) \subset V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. In this case $\text{pos}(P_{|P|}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$ and since $P_{|P|}$ is visible from the east by the definition of an exposed path assembly, then fact 7.4 leads to a contradiction.

□

Corollary 7.10. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$, then $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$.*

Let t be the first highest tile of P then the first lowest tile of P is defined as the index s such that $s = \min\{i : y_{P_i} = y_{P_{[1,t]}}\}$. Remark that by definition $s \leq t$, we now prove two properties about P_s if there exists at least one tile visible from the west and directed to the south.

Lemma 7.11. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if there exists a tile of P which is visible from the west, oriented to the south and not hidden by the seed then $y_P < y_\sigma$.*

Proof. See Figure 95 for an illustration of this proof. Let $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_\mathbf{1}$ is visible from the west, oriented to the south and not hidden by the seed, let $1 \leq t \leq |P|$ such P_t is the first highest tile of P. By lemma 7.5, $\mathcal{V}_\sigma^{P_{[1,t]}} = \mathcal{V}_\sigma^P$ and since $P_\mathbf{1}$ is visible from the west and not hidden by the seed then $\mathbf{1} < t$. Let Q be the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{1},t]}$ and by hypothesis and fact 7.6, the path Q has its extremity Q_1 visible from the west and not hidden by the seed and its extremity $Q_{|Q|}$ visible from the east and not hidden by the seed. Then let (C^+, C^-) be the cut of the grid by the path Q with visible extremities and let W be its window. Consider an indexing of W such that $W_1 = Q_1$ and $W_{|Q|} = Q_{|Q|}$. We consider that C^+ is the left side of W and then for any position $(x, y) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$ we have $y > y_{P_{[\mathbf{1},t]}} \geq y_P$. Now, since $P_\mathbf{1}$ is not hidden by the seed then $\mathbf{1} > 1$. Moreover since $P_\mathbf{1}$ is visible from the west and oriented to the south then $(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}, P_\mathbf{1})$ is an edge on the left side of W and since P is simple then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}-1}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. Now, since $P_\mathbf{1}$ is visible from the west and not hidden by the seed and since P_t is visible from the east in $P_{[1,t]}$ and not hidden by the seed then $\text{dom}(\sigma) \cap V(W) = \emptyset$ and $\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \cap V(W) = \emptyset$. Since $P_{\mathbf{1}-1} \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$ then $P_1 \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$ and since $\text{pos}(P_1) \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$ then $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. Thus, $y_\sigma > y_P$. □

Lemma 7.12. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, consider s the first lowest tile of P then if there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that tile $P_\mathbf{1}$ is visible from the west, not hidden by the seed and oriented to the south in P then $y_{P_s} = y_P$ and P_s is visible from the west, oriented to the south and exits to east.*

Proof. See Figure 96 for an illustration of this proof. Let t be the fist highest tile of P. By definition of s, we $s \leq t$. By lemma 7.11, we have $y_P < y_\sigma$, and if $y_{P_s} > y_P$ then P has a long tail which contradicts the definition of an exposed path assembly and then $y_{P_s} = y_P$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that P_s is not visible from the west. Then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} = y_{P_s}$, $x_{P_\mathbf{2}} > y_{P_s}$ and $P_\mathbf{2}$ is visible from the west. By definition of s, we have $s < \mathbf{2}$. Moreover, by lemma 7.7 since $P_\mathbf{1}$ is oriented to the south then $P_\mathbf{2}$ is also oriented to the south. Then, $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}-1}) = \text{pos}(P_\mathbf{2}) + (0, 1)$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}+1}) = \text{pos}(P_\mathbf{2}) - (1, 0)$. Now consider the index

$\mathbf{3}$ such that $s \leq \mathbf{3} < \mathbf{2}$ and $y_{P_\mathbf{3}} = y_{P_s}$ and $x_{P_\mathbf{3}} = \max\{x < x_{P_\mathbf{2}} : (x, y_{P_s}) \in \mathrm{dom}(P_{[s,\mathbf{1}]})\}$. Now consider the path Q from $P_\mathbf{3}$ to $P_\mathbf{2}$ such that $Q_{i+1} = Q_i + (1,0)$. Then let R be the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$, let C be the simple cycle defined by $Q \cup R$ and let G^I be its interior. Then $P_{\mathbf{2}+1} \in V(G^I)$. Moreover, since $P_{|P|}$ is visible from the west then $P_{|P|} \notin V(G^I)$. Thus there exists $\mathbf{4} > \mathbf{2}$ such $P_\mathbf{4} \in V(C)$ and $P_\mathbf{4} \notin V(G^I)$. Since P is simple $P_\mathbf{4} \notin \mathrm{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]})$ and then $y_{P_\mathbf{4}} = y_{P_s}$ and $y_{P_{\mathbf{4}+1}} = y_{P_\mathbf{4}} - (0,1)$ which contradicts the definition of s. Then s is visible from the west and since $y_{P_s} = y_P$ then s has to exit to the east. □

All the previous results have been shown for an exposed path assembly. We end this subsection by giving a method to extract efficiently an exposed path assembly from a path assembly with a long tail.

Lemma 7.13. *Consider a path assembly P producible by the tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ such that $Y_P > Y_\sigma$, $\mathrm{dom}(P) \cap \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) = P_1$ and P has a long tail. Let $1 \leq t \leq |P|$ such that P_t is the highest tile of P then there exists $t \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ is an exposed path assembly and $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} = \min\{y_{P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}}, y_\sigma\}$.*

Proof. See figure 97 for a graphical representation of this part of the proof. Since the tail of P is long, then let $\mathbf{3} = \min\{t < i \leq |P| : y_{p_i} = \min\{y_{P_{[1,t]}}, y_\sigma\}\}$. If $P_\mathbf{3}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}$ and not hidden by the seed, then $P_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}$ satisfies the conditions of our lemma. By contradiction suppose that $P_\mathbf{3}$ is not visible from the east or hidden from the seed. Then let $t \leq \mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3}$ such that $P_\mathbf{2}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}$ and $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} = y_{P_t}$. Now, remark that $P_\mathbf{3}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$. Then, both extremities of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ are visible from the east. Consider the cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid by the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ whose extremities are both visible from the east. Let W be the window of this cut of the grid, let $m = \mathbf{2} - \mathbf{1}$ and consider an indexing of the window coherent with $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ ($W_0 = \mathrm{pos}(P_\mathbf{2})$ and $W_m = \mathrm{pos}(P_\mathbf{3})$). Now, remark that either $\mathbf{2} = t$ and in this case P_{t-1} does not belong to C^+ or $\mathbf{2} > t$ and in this case P_t does not belong to C^+. If $P_\mathbf{3}$ is not visible from the east in $P_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}$ or hidden by the seed then there exists a path R such that R is a subgraph of the binding graph of $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}-1]} \cup \sigma$, $R_1 \notin C^+$ and $R_{|R|} \in V(W)$. Then let $\mathbf{4} = \min\{1 \leq i \leq |R| : \mathrm{pos}(P_i) \in C^+\}$ then there exists $\mathbf{5} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $W_\mathbf{5} = \mathrm{pos}(R_\mathbf{4})$. Now, if $\mathbf{5} < 0$ remark that the only neighboring position of $W_\mathbf{5}$ which does not belong to C^+ is $(x_{W_\mathbf{5}}, y_{W_\mathbf{5}} + 1)$ and then $\mathrm{pos}(R_{\mathbf{4}-1}) = (x_{R_\mathbf{4}}, y_{R_\mathbf{4}} - 1)$ which contradicts the definition of t. If $0 \leq \mathbf{5} \leq m$ then R and $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ intersect which contradicts the fact that P is simple or the fact that $V(P) \cap V(\sigma) = \mathrm{pos}(P_1)$. If $\mathbf{5} > m$ then $\mathrm{pos}(R_{\mathbf{4}-1}) = (x_{R_\mathbf{4}}, y_{R_\mathbf{4}} - 1)$ which contradicts the definition of $\mathbf{3}$. All cases lead to contradictions.

□

7.3 Fork

In this section, we introduce *fork* which are useful to build stakes and to prove a powerful lemma about U-turn which will lead to all the final results. We give here the definition of fork and one method relying on cuts of the grid to build them.

Definition 7.14. Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. Consider two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$, the vector $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-} P_{s^+}}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and a path assembly F. The path assembly F is a fork of P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at indices s^- and s^+ if and only if:

- $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F$ and $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F + \overrightarrow{v})$ are simple path assemblies producible by $\mathcal{T}$;
- for all edges e of the underlying path of F, either there exists an edge e' of the underlying path of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ such that $e = e'$ or there exists an edge e' of the underlying path of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$ such that $e = e' - \overrightarrow{v}$.
- for all $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$, if $F_{\mathbf{1}} + \overrightarrow{v} \in \text{dom}(P)$ (resp. $F_{\mathbf{1}} \in \text{dom}(P)$) and $F_{\mathbf{2}} + \overrightarrow{v} \in \text{dom}(P)$ (resp. $F_{\mathbf{2}} \in \text{dom}(P)$) then there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$ (resp. $s^- \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$) such that $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (resp. $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{3}}$) and $F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_{\mathbf{4}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (resp. $F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_{\mathbf{4}}$).

According to the second and third items of this definition, the fork F is a path assembly made of segments of $P_{[s^-,t]}$ and segments of $P_{[s^+,t]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ which also means that $F + \overrightarrow{v}$, the translation of the fork by $\overrightarrow{v}$, is made of segments of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$ and $P_{[s^-,|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Intuitively, when a fork is found then two path assemblies can be created from P. The first one is an hybrid between P and $P - \overrightarrow{v}$ and the second one is an hybrid between P and $P + \overrightarrow{v}$. The third item of this definition also means that the tiles of F appear in the same order as in $P_{[s^-,t]}$ or as in $P_{[s^+,t]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Also remark that if there exist three indexes such that $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |F|$, $s^- \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$, $s^+ \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$, $\text{pos}(F_{\mathbf{1}}) = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}})$ and $\text{pos}(F_{\mathbf{1}}) = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) - \overrightarrow{v}$ then by the third item of this definition we have $\text{type}(F_{\mathbf{1}}) = \text{type}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) = \text{type}(P_{\mathbf{3}})$. If this property is not true then either $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F$ is in conflict with P or $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F + \overrightarrow{v})$ is in conflict with P. Then if there exists a fork of length at least one, this remark means that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment. See figure 98 for an illustration of the following examples of forks. Consider a candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $P' = P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is a fork of P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at indices $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$. Remark that in this case, the path assembly $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ satisfies the conditions for being a stake, half of the work is done. Nevertheless, the method to find the other stake has to wait until the end of the article. Also, remark that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}]} = P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is always a fork of length 1. Thus, building a fork is not hard but building long fork is.

We present now a method to build long fork. This method takes as input an exposed path assembly P and a visible candidate segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ of P (from now now and until the end of the section we will always consider exposed path assembly). The fork is constructed inside a specific area of the plane called the *free zone* $\mathcal{F}$ which is devoid of any obstacle. More precisely, $\mathcal{F}$ is a subgraph of G defined as follow (see Figure 99).

Definition 7.15. Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- \leq s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Consider the cut of the grid (C^+, C^-) defined by the underlying path of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ whose extremity $\text{pos}(P_{s^-})$ is visible from the west and whose extremity $\text{pos}(P_{|P|})$ is visible from the east. Let W be the window of this cut and consider an indexing of W coherent with $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$. Then the *free zone* $\mathcal{F}$ of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is the graph C^+ (the left side of the window W). The window W of the free zone is the window of the cut of the grid (C^+, C^-).

We now fix some notations for the window W of the free area $\mathcal{F}$. Let $m = |P| - s^-$, $n = s^+ - s^-$, we always consider the indexing of W coherent with P: the indexing such that $W_0 = \text{pos}(P_{s^-})$, $W_n = \text{pos}(P_{s^+})$ and $W_m = \text{pos}(P_{|P|})$. Remark that the window is made of three parts $W_{[-\infty,0]}$, $W_{[0,m]}$ and $W_{[m,+\infty]}$ where $W_{[0,m]}$ is the underlying path of $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and for all $\mathbf{3} \leq 0$ (resp. $\mathbf{3} \geq m$), we have $x_{W_{\mathbf{3}}} < x_{P_{\mathbf{3}}}$ (resp. $x_{W_{\mathbf{3}}} > x_{P_{|P|}}$) and $y_{W_{\mathbf{3}}} = y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$ (resp. $y_{W_{\mathbf{3}}} = y_{P_{|P|}}$). Of course, a path starting in the free zone has to intersect the window in order to

leave it. We now show that the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is occupied only by tiles of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ (see Figure 99). This remark allow us to build a fork in the free zone without fearing collision with the seed or with $P_{[1,s^--1]}$ (if a collision occurs between the fork and $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ then P is fragile).

Lemma 7.16. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ then $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \cap V(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$ and $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,s^--1]}) \cap V(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Consider the window W of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ and a coherent indexing of W. By definition $\mathcal{F}$ is the left side of this cut and we also have $W_{-1} = (x_{P_{s^-}} - 1, y_{P_{s^-}})$, $W_0 = P_{s^-}$ and $W_1 = P_{s^-+1}$. Moreover, since P_{s^-} is visible from the west then $W_{-1} \neq \mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1})$. Since P_{s^-} is oriented to the north then either P_{s^-} exits to the north or to the east. See Figure 100 for a graphical representation of the following reasoning. If P_{s^-} exits to the north then $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^-+1}) = (x_{P_s^-}, y_{P_{s^-}} + 1)$ and either $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) = (x_{P_s^-} + 1, y_{P_s^-})$ or $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) = (x_{P_s^-}, y_{P_{s^-}} - 1)$, in both cases $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) \notin V(\mathcal{F})$. If P_{s^-} exits to the east then $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^-+1}) = (x_{P_s^-} + 1, y_{P_{s^-}})$ and $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) = (x_{P_s^-}, y_{P_{s^-}} - 1)$, in this case $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) \notin V(\mathcal{F})$. Then in both cases the tile P_{s^--1} does not belong to the free zone, *i.e.* $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) \notin V(\mathcal{F})$. Since P is a simple path assembly, $s^- \in \mathcal{V}^P$ and $P_{|P|}$ is visible from the east then $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,s^--1]}) \cap V(W) = \emptyset$. Moreover, since $\mathrm{pos}(P_1) \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$, since the seed is connected and since the visibility of $P_{|P|}$ and P_{s^-} are not hidden by the seed then we also have $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \cap V(W) = \emptyset$. Since $\mathrm{pos}(P_{s^--1}) \notin V(\mathcal{F})$ then $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,s^--1]}) \cap V(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$ and $\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,s^--1]}) \cap V(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$

□

Also the free zone possesses two important properties: $y_{P_{s^+}} > y_{P_s^-}$ due to corollary 7.10 and any position west of P_{s^+} belongs to the free zone.

Lemma 7.17. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and $\overrightarrow{v}$ be the direction of $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ then $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ and for any position $(x, y) \in V(G)$ if $y = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and $x < x_{P_{s^+}}$ then $(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let W be the window of the free zone and consider a coherent indexing of W and let $m = |P| - s^-$. Since $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment then by corollary 7.10, we have $y_{s^+} > y_{s^-}$. Now consider a position $(x, y) \in V(G)$ such that $y = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and $x < x_{P_{s^+}}$. For the sake of contradiction suppose that $(x, y) \in V(W)$ then there exists $\mathbf{1}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{1}} = (x, y)$. If $\mathbf{1} < 0$ then $y_{P_{s^-}} = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and since P is simple and $s^- < s^+$ then tiles P_{s^-} and P_{s^+} are two different tiles and cannot be both visible from the west. If $0 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq m$ then $\mathbf{1} \neq s^+$ and by definition of (x, y), P_{s^+} is not visible from the west. Finally if $\mathbf{1} > m$, then $y_{P_{s^+}} = y = y_{P_{|P|}}$ and $x_{P_{|P|}} < x < x_{P_{s^+}}$ which contradicts the fact that $P_{|P|}$ is visible by the east (by definition of an exposed path assembly). Then either for all $(x, y) \in V(G)$ such that $y = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and $x < x_{P_{s^+}}$, $(x, y) \in V(\mathcal{F})$ or for all $(x, y) \in V(G)$ such that $y = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and $x < x_{P_{s^+}}$, $(x, y) \notin V(\mathcal{F})$. Now consider a position (x, y) such that $y = y_{P_{s^+}} > y_{P_{s^-}}$ and $x < X_P$ (see Figure 99b), then (x, y) is in the west side of the window W and thus in the free zone. □

As a corollary of this result, the ray starting in P_{s^+} and going west splits the free zone into two zones. Then, any arc starting in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ with $\mathbf{1} \leq s^+$ and ending in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ with $\mathbf{2} \geq s^+$ has to hide the visibility of P_{s^+} (see Figure 101). This remark is summarized in the following corollary.

Corollary 7.18. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and W be its window. Consider a coherent indexing of the window and let $n = s^+ - s^-$. Then, for any arc A of $\mathcal{F}$ which starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ with $\mathbf{1} \leq n$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ with $\mathbf{2} \geq n$, there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |A|$ such that $y_{A_{\mathbf{3}}} = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and $x_{A_{\mathbf{3}}} \leq x_{P_{s^+}}$.*

Before stating the method to build our fork, we define some properties that our fork will satisfy.

Definition 7.19. Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- \leq s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$, $m = |P| - s^-$, $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and W be its window. Consider a coherent indexing of W. Then, a fork F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at indices s^- and s^+ is *long* if and only if:

- the underlying paths of F and $F + \overrightarrow{v}$ are both subgraphs of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$;
- there exists $\mathbf{1} \geq m$ such that either $\text{pos}(F_{|F|}) = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ or $\text{pos}(F_{|F|}) + \overrightarrow{v} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$.

The first item of our definition means that our long fork and its translation by $\overrightarrow{v}$ both belong to the free zone. The second item means that our fork or its translation by $\overrightarrow{v}$ manages to reach with its last tile a position of $V(W_{[m,+\infty]})$, *i.e* a position which is east of $\text{pos}(P_{|P|})$. Since a fork starts in P_{s^-} and its translation by $\overrightarrow{v}$ starts in P_{s^+}, they have to get around $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ to reach $W_{[m,+\infty]}$. Note that the fork cannot take a shortcut through $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ otherwise its underlying path would not be a subgraph to $\mathcal{F}$. Intuitively, a long fork starts on the west side of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ and reaches its east side. Later, this property will assure us to have a long enough fork to be useful. In fact, if a fork F is long then it is possible to prove that $Y_F \geq Y_P - y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ but since this property is not necessary, we will not prove it.

Now, we explain our method to build a long fork and the aim of the following sequence of lemmas. Let $m = |P| - s$ and $n = s^+ - s^-$, we remind that the underling path of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$ is $W_{[n,m]}$. Before building a long fork, we will look for the underlying path of this fork. We call it a *trajectory* and will be denoted by D. Since we are looking for a path made of segments of $W_{[0,m]}$ or $W_{[n,m]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and which is a subgraph a $\mathcal{F}$ then the first intuition is to consider the decomposition of $W_{[n,m]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$. Unfortunately this decomposition is not always positive (see Figure 102d). This fact will be problematic to satisfy the third property of a fork (see definition 7.14). To avoid this problem we consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of $W_{[n,\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ (see Figure 102). We will show that this decomposition is always positive (Lemma 7.21). To define the trajectory, we proceed in three steps. First we show that there exists an index $\mathbf{2} \geq n$ such that $W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is the extremum path extracted from $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and that the decomposition of $W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs is $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ (Lemma 7.20 and Figure 103a). As a first corollary of this result, if we consider the window W' associated to $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$, then there exists an indexing of W' such that for all $i \leq 0$, we have $W'_i = W_i$, moreover $W_0 = W'_0 = W_n - \overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 103b). As a second corollary of this result, there exists an index $\mathbf{1} \geq 0$ such that there exists an index $\mathbf{3} \geq m$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{3}}$ or $W'_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 103b). Without loss of generality we can suppose that $\mathbf{1}$ is the first index to satisfy this property. The definition of this index is the second step (see Definition 7.22) and we can now consider the path $W'_{[0,\mathbf{1}]}$ (see Figure 103c). By definition, this path is a

subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ and the third step is to prove that $W'_{[0,\mathbf{1}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ (see Lemma 7.24 and Figure 103d). Finally, $W'_{[0,\mathbf{1}]}$ satisfies all the properties to be the underlying path of a long fork and is the trajectory we are looking for. Remark that the trajectory is made of arcs of the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and of dual segments of W according to this decomposition. Finally, we try to build a fork using this trajectory. To achieve this aim we use an algorithm illustrated in Figures of appendix F.1. This algorithm alternates between two phases, one phase tries to tile an arc of the decomposition (see Figures from 120 to 122 and Figures from 126 to 128) and the other phase tries to tile a dual segment of the decomposition (see Figures 118 and 119 and Figure from 123 to 125). Eventually, we obtain that either P is fragile or that there exists a long fork. The correctness of this algorithm is proven in Lemma 7.25.

Now, we start by the first step of our method.

Lemma 7.20. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of W. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$ and then the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is correctly defined. Moreover, let (C^+, C^-) be the cut of the grid associated to $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and let $\mathbf{1} \geq n$ and $\mathbf{2} \geq n$ such that $W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is the extremum path extracted from $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then $\mathbf{1} = n$, $W_{[\mathbf{2},+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of C^- and $W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is positive.*

Proof. Firstly, we show that $V(W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W)$ is finite. Let $m = |P| - s^-$ then $V(W_{[n,m]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W)$ is finite since $W_{[n,m]}$ is finite. Also, $V(W_{[m,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W_{[0,m]})$ is finite since $W_{[0,m]}$ is finite. Moreover since by lemma 7.17, we have $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$ then we have $V(W_{[m,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) = \emptyset$. Finally, $V(W_{[m,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W_{[-\infty,0]}) = \emptyset$ otherwise since $W_m = P_{|P|}$, we have $\mathrm{pos}(P_{|P|}) \in W_{[-\infty,0]}$ and P_{s^-} would not be visible from the west. Then $V(W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W)$ is finite and the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is correctly defined.

Secondly, let $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ such that $W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is the extremum path extracted from $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then by definition of $\overrightarrow{v}$, we have $P_{s^+} - \overrightarrow{v} = P_{s^-}$ and by the definition of a coherent indexing, we have $W_0 = P_{s^-}$ then there exists $\mathbf{3} \leq 0$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = W_{\mathbf{1}} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Now, if $\mathbf{3} < 0$ and if $\mathbf{1} \leq m$ (see Figure 104a), then there exists an index $s^+ < \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{4}} - \overrightarrow{v}) = W_{\mathbf{3}}$ and then $y_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} - y_{\overrightarrow{v}} = y_{P_{s^-}}$ and $x_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} - x_{\overrightarrow{v}} < x_{P_{s^-}}$. Note that, $y_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} = y_{P_{s^-}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} = y_{P_{s^+}}$ and $x_{P_{\mathbf{4}}} < x_{P_{s^-}} + x_{\overrightarrow{v}} \leq x_{P_{s^+}}$. Then, this fact contradicts the hypothesis that P_{s^+} is visible from the west. Finally, if $\mathbf{1} > m$ then there exists $\mathbf{5} < \mathbf{1} < 0$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{|P|}) = W_{\mathbf{5}}$ which contradicts the definition of $\mathbf{1}$. Then $\mathbf{3} = 0$, $\mathbf{1} = n$ and $W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is positive.

Now, consider the cut (C^+, C^-) associated to $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and its window W' (see Figure 105 for a graphical representation of this part of the proof). We consider that C^+ is the left side of W' and C^- the right side. Now let $R = (W_{[\mathbf{2}+1,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v})$, since $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ is a simple path then R and $W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ does not intersect. Moreover since $W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is the extremum path extracted from $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then $V(R) \cap V(W') = \emptyset$. Thus either $V(R) \subset (V(C^+) \setminus V(W))$ or $V(R) \subset (V(C^-) \setminus V(W))$. Now, since by lemma 7.17 we have $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq 1$, then there exists $\mathbf{6}$ such $x_{R_{\mathbf{6}}} > X_P$ and $y_{R_{\mathbf{6}}} < y_{P_{|P|}}$ and then $R_{\mathbf{6}} \in V(C^-)$. Thus $V(R) \subset (V(C^-) \setminus V(W))$.

□

Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ and the dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq \ell}$ of W. Then as a corollary of this result, we have $D^0 = W_{[-\infty,0]}$ (see

Figure 102c). We now show that this result also implies that the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is positive.

Lemma 7.21. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, its window W and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$ and consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$, then this decomposition is positive.*

Proof. By lemma 7.23, there exists $\mathbf{2} \geq n$ such that $Q = W_{[n,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is the extremum path extracted from $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Moreover, the path Q is positive. Consider the cut (C^+, C^-) associated to Q, its window W' and an indexing of W' coherent with Q. We consider that C^+ is the left side of W' and C^- the right side. By lemma 7.20, $W_{[\mathbf{2},+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of C^-. Since the free zone is the left side of W then by lemma 5.12, the decomposition of Q into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is the same decomposition as $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Finally, since Q is positive then by lemma 5.25, the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is positive. □

Lemma 7.20 allows us to define the trajectory D which will be the underlying path of the fork we aim to assemble (see Figure 103c).

Definition 7.22. Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of W. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$ and consider a decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$. Let W' be the window associate to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ and consider the indexing of W' such that for all $i \leq 0$, we have $W_i = W'_i$. Let $\mathbf{1} = \min\{i :\in \mathbb{Z} : W'_i \in V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) \text{ or } W'_i + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(W_{[m,+\infty]})\}$ then the *trajectory* D of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is $W'_{[0,\mathbf{1}]}$.

The following lemma stipulates that the trajectory D is a subgraph to the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ which satisfies most of the conditions requires for being the underlying path of a long fork.

Lemma 7.23. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the path D is a subgraph of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ which starts in W_0. Moreover, let $m = |P| - s^-$ and then $D_{|D|} \in V(W_{[m,+\infty]})$ or $D_{|D|} + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(W_{[m,+\infty]})$ and any edge of $E(D)$ belongs to the underlying path of either $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ or $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$.*

Proof. By its definition, the path D is a subgraph of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ such that $D_{|D|} \in V(W_{[m,+\infty]})$ or $D_{|D|} + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(W_{[m,+\infty]})$ and $E(D) \subset (E(W_{[0,+\infty]}) \cup E(W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}))$. Moreover, we also have by definition $V(D) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) \subset \{D_{|D|}\}$ and $V(D) + \overrightarrow{v} \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) \subset \{D_{|D|} + \overrightarrow{v}\}$. By lemma 7.20, D starts in W_0. Now for the sake of contradiction suppose that there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |D| - 1$ such that the edge $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ does not belong to the underlying path of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$ or to the underlying path of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then there exists $\mathbf{2} \geq m$ such that $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (W_{\mathbf{2}}, W_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ or $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (W_{\mathbf{2}}, W_{\mathbf{2}+1}) - \overrightarrow{v}$ or there exists $\mathbf{2} > m$ such that $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (W_{\mathbf{2}}, W_{\mathbf{2}-1})$ or $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1}) = (W_{\mathbf{2}}, W_{\mathbf{2}-1}) - \overrightarrow{v}$. In both cases, the path D should have ended before $\mathbf{1}$ which is a contradiction. □

Now, we prove that $D + \overrightarrow{v}$, the trajectory translated by $\overrightarrow{v}$, is also a subgraph of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ (see Figure 103d).

Lemma 7.24. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, let W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$ and let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the path $D + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ which starts in P_{s^+} (*i.e.*, $V(D + \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W_{[-\infty,n-1]}) = \emptyset$).*

Proof. Let $m = |P| - s^-$ and consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ and consider its complementary decomposition $(D^i)_{0 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of the window W. By lemma 7.21, this decomposition is positive. Consider $u \in E(D)$, then by the definition of D there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that either $u \in E(A^i)$ or $u \in E(D^i)$. If $u \in E(A^i)$, note that $A^i + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$, which is a subgraph of the window W and of the free zone $\mathcal{F}$, then $u + \overrightarrow{v} \in E(\mathcal{F})$ and no extremities of u are in $W_{[-\infty,n-1]}$.

If $u \in E(D^i)$, see Figure 104b for a graphical representation of the rest of the proof. Since P_{s^-} and P_{s^+} both exit either to the north or to the east and since by lemma 7.20, we have $A^1_1 = P_{s^-}$ then we have $|A^1| > 1$. Moreover by lemma 7.20, we can applied lemma 5.28 and then the edge (D^i_1, D^i_2) belongs strictly to the west side of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then the edge $(D^i_1, D^i_2) + \overrightarrow{v}$ belongs strictly to the west side of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ and thus to $E(\mathcal{F})$. Now, let $\mathbf{1} > 0$ such that $W_{\mathbf{1}} = A^i_{|A^i|}$ and let $\mathbf{5} \geq n$ such that $W_{\mathbf{5}} - \overrightarrow{v} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$. Also, let $\mathbf{4} > \mathbf{1}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{4}} = D^i_{|D^i|}$ and let $\mathbf{6} \geq n$ such that $W_{\mathbf{6}} - \overrightarrow{v} = W_{\mathbf{4}}$. Since $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ is positive then $\mathbf{6} > \mathbf{5}$. By lemma 5.4, we have $D^i \cap (W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}) = \{D^i_1, D^i_{|D^i|}\} = \{W_{\mathbf{1}}, W_{\mathbf{4}}\}$ and then $D^i + \overrightarrow{v} \cap W_{[n,+\infty]} = \{W_{\mathbf{5}}, W_{\mathbf{6}}\}$. Now either $(D^i + \overrightarrow{v})$ is an arc of $\mathcal{F}$ or $(D^i + \overrightarrow{v}) \cap W_{[-\infty,n-1]} \neq \emptyset$. In the first case, then $u \in E(\mathcal{F})$. In the second case, then there exists $\mathbf{3}$ such that $\mathbf{3} = \min\{j \geq \mathbf{1} : W_j + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(W_{[-\infty,n-1]})\}$ and let $\mathbf{7} < n$ such that $W_{\mathbf{7}} = W_{\mathbf{3}} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Then $W_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is an arc of $\mathcal{F}$ which starts in $W_1 + \overrightarrow{v} = W_5$ with $\mathbf{5} \geq n$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{3}} + \overrightarrow{v} = W_{\mathbf{7}}$ with $\mathbf{7} < n$. By corollary 7.18, there exists an index $\mathbf{2}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3}$, such that $x_{W_{\mathbf{2}}} + x_{\overrightarrow{v}} < x_{P_{s^+}}$ and $y_{W_{\mathbf{2}}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} = y_{P_{s^+}}$ then $x_{W_{\mathbf{2}}} < x_{P_{s^-}}$ and $y_{W_2} = y_{P_{s^-}}$ and thus P_{s^-} is not visible from the west which is a contradiction.

To conclude for all $u \in E(D)$, we have $u + \overrightarrow{v} \in E(\mathcal{F})$, then $D + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of D. Moreover, we have $V(D + \overrightarrow{v}) \cap V(W_{[-\infty,n-1]}) = \emptyset$.

□

Now, we can try to create a fork whose binding graph matches the trajectory D.

Lemma 7.25. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and W its window. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$. Then either P is fragile or there exists a long fork F of P of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ at indices s^- and s^+ such that the underlying path of F is D.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by recurrence. Consider the following hypothesis for all $1 \leq i \leq |D|$, $H(i)$: "either P is fragile or there exists a fork F such that the underlying path of F is $D_{[1,i]}$". First note that $P_{[s^+,s^+]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is always a fork and then $H(1)$ is true. Now, suppose that $H(i)$ is true for $1 \leq i \leq |D| - 1$. Then, by the definition of D and by the fact that the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ is positive (Lemma 7.21), either there exists $s^- \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such that the edge (D_i, D_{i+1})

is equal to $(P_{\mathbf{3}}, P_{\mathbf{3}+1})$ or there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such that the edge (D_i, D_{i+1}) is equal to $(P_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}, P_{\mathbf{3}+1} - \overrightarrow{v})$. See Figures of appendix F.1 for the intuition of the two following cases.
Case $(D_i, D_{i+1}) = (P_{\mathbf{3}}, P_{\mathbf{3}+1})$: then either $\text{type}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) = \text{type}(F_{|F|})$ or $\text{type}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \neq \text{type}(F_{|F|})$. In the second case, since F is a fork then $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and P is fragile. Otherwise, let $F' = F \cdot P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{3}+1]}$ which is a path assembly whose binding graph is $D_{[1,i+1]}$ and by lemmas 7.16 and 7.23, $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F'$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and by lemmas 7.16 and 7.24, $P_{[1,s^+} \cdot (F' + \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$. In this case $H(i+1)$ is true.
Case $(D_i, D_{i+1}) = (P_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v}, P_{\mathbf{3}+1} - \overrightarrow{v})$: then either $\text{type}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) = \text{type}(F_{|F|})$ or $\text{type}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \neq \text{type}(F_{|F|})$. If $\text{type}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \neq \text{type}(F_{|F|})$, since F is a fork then $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F + \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and P is fragile. Otherwise $F' = F \cdot (P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{3}+1]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly whose binding graph is $D_{[1,i+1]}$ and by lemmas 7.16 and 7.23, $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F'$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and by lemmas 7.16 and 7.24, $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F' + \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$. In this case, $H(i+1)$ is true.

To conclude, Since $H(|D|)$ is true, then either P is fragile or there exists a fork F such that the binding graph of F is D and in this case F is long.

□

7.4 U-turn

We now introduce U-turn, an exposed path assembly makes a U-turn if its last tile is low enough (see figure 106).

Definition 7.26. Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. We say that the path P makes a U-turn if and only if there exists two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and $y_{P_{|P|}} < y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. We say that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+.

The goal of this part is to show that an exposed path assembly which makes a U-turn is fragile or pumpable (lemma 7.38). This result is a powerful tool for proving the three remaining macroscopic lemmas. Nevertheless, the proof of this result is the most technical part of the article and lot of details are crucial here. This result is done is five steps. The first step concern some preliminary results on the trajectory on an exposed path assembly which does a U-turn. The second step is to introduce dominant tiles which satisfy several constraints. The third step is to show that a dominant tile always belongs to a good candidate segment and the fourth step is to show that either this segment is pumpable or there exists another dominant tile with a greater index than the previous one. The fifth and final step is to show that a path which does a U-turn contains at least one dominant tile. Thus the last dominant tile of P always belong to a good pumpable candidate segment and this remark concludes the proof.

The trajectory and fork introduced in the previous section play a key role for finding dominant tile. When the path assembly P does a U-turn, the trajectory can be described more precisely: the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to the one of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and thus the trajectory is a extremum arc of the free zone (see Figure 107 and Lemma 7.27). Cases like the one in Figure 103c cannot occur anymore.

Lemma 7.27. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of*

P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$, then the decomposition of the underlying path of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is identical to the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let $m = |P| - s^-$. By lemma 7.20, there exists $\mathbf{1}$ such that $W_{[n,\mathbf{1}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is the extremum path extracted from $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Moreover by lemma 5.12, the decomposition of $W_{[n,\mathbf{1}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is identical to the one of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. By definition of a U-turn, for all $i \geq m$, we have $y_{W_i} - y_{\overrightarrow{v}} = y_{P_{|P|}} - y_{\overrightarrow{v}} < y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}}$. Then for all $i \geq m$, we have $W_i \notin V(\mathcal{F})$ (see Figure 107b). Since $W_{\mathbf{1}} - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(W)$ then $\mathbf{1} \leq m$ and then there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $W_{\mathbf{1}} = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}})$. Thus the decomposition of the underlying path of $P_{[s^+,\mathbf{2}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$ is identical to the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$.

□

According to the definition of a trajectory D then either $D_{|D|} \in W_{[m,+\infty]}$ or $D_{|D|} + \overrightarrow{v} \in W_{[m,+\infty]}$ but when P does a U-turn then only the first case occurs.

Lemma 7.28. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then there exists $\mathbf{1} \geq m$ such that $D_{|D|} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$.*

Proof. By the definition of a trajectory, there exists $\mathbf{1} \geq m$ such that either $D_{|D|} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ or $D_{|D|} + \overrightarrow{v} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$. If $D_{|D|} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$ then the lemma is true. For the sake of contradiction suppose that $D_{|D|} + \overrightarrow{v} = W_{\mathbf{1}}$. By lemma 7.27, the decomposition of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arc in $\mathcal{F}$ is identical to the one of the underlying path of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Now, by the definition of a trajectory either there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $D_{|D|} = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) - \overrightarrow{v}$ or there exists $s^- \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such that $D_{|D|} = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}})$. In the first case, then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) = W_{\mathbf{1}}$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{1} \geq m$ then $\mathbf{1} = m$ and $\mathbf{2} = |P|$. Then $D_{|D|} = P_{|P|} - \overrightarrow{v}$ but by definition of a u-turn, we have $y_{P_{|P|}} - \overrightarrow{v} < y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}}$ and then $\text{pos}(P_{|P|}) \notin V(\mathcal{F})$ which is a contradiction. In the second case, since $\mathbf{1} \geq m$ then $y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} = y_{P_{|P|}}$ then by definition of a U-turn $y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} < y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}}$. Since $s^- \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ then it is a contradiction. □

We remind that by the definition of D, we have $|V(D) \cap W_{[m,+\infty]}| \leq 1$ then lemma 7.28 implies that $V(D) \cap W_{[m,+\infty]} = D_{|D|}$ and then D is an extremum arc of the free zone (see Figure 107b).

Corollary 7.29. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and let W be its window, consider a coherent indexing of W. Let $m = |P| - s^-$ and let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ then D is an extremum arc of $\mathcal{F}$ which starts in W_0 and ends in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ with $\mathbf{1} \geq m$.*

This corollary concludes the preliminary results about the trajectory of a path doing a U-turn. We now aim to introduce dominant tiles. Such tiles will help us to locate good pumpable segments. Moreover we would like that the extensions of these pumpable segments stay inside the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ in order to use lemma 7.16 to avoid collision with the seed or with $P_{[1,s^-]}$. The

binding graph of such an extension would split the configuration in two zones. Thus we have a particular interest in tiles where the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ could be split by the extension a good path of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figure 108). More formally we are looking for an index $s^- \leq d \leq |P|$ and a good path C of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $C_1 = \text{pos}(P_d)$ and $C^{+\omega}$ splits $\mathcal{F}$ into two zones. The fact that the trajectory is an extremum arc (corollary 7.29) has several consequences on P_d which are stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.30. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Consider $s^- \leq d \leq |P|$ and a good path C of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $C_1 = \text{pos}(P_d)$ and $C^{+\omega}$ splits the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$, then:*

- *there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |D|$ such that $D_{\mathbf{2}} = \text{pos}(P_d)$;*
- *moreover, $V(D) \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{D_{\mathbf{2}}\}$;*
- *$D_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ and $D_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$.*

Proof. See Figure 109 for an illustration of this proof. Let $m = |P| - s^-$. By corollary 7.29, D is an extremum arc of the free zone which starts in W_0 and ends in $W_{\mathbf{4}}$ with $\mathbf{4} \geq m$. Moreover, since $s^- \leq d \leq |P|$ then $W_0 \in V(\mathcal{F}^-)$ and $W_{\mathbf{4}} \in V(\mathcal{F}^+)$. Thus, the arc D intersects with $C^{+\omega}$. Let $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |D|$ such that $D_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(C^{+\omega})$. Then, there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{5} \leq |P|$ such that either $P_{\mathbf{5}} = D_{\mathbf{2}} + \overrightarrow{v}$ or $P_{\mathbf{5}} = D_{\mathbf{2}}$. We remind that by definition of a split, we have $V(P_{[s^-,|P|]}) \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{\text{pos}(P_d)\}$. Then, in the first case, $P_{\mathbf{5}} \in C^{*+\omega}$ which is a contradiction and in the second case, we have $\mathbf{5} = d$ and then $D_{\mathbf{2}} = \text{pos}(P_d)$. Thus, we have $V(D) \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{\text{pos}(P_d)\}$. Finally by definition of a trajectory, $D_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ (resp. $D_{[\mathbf{2},|D|]}$) is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ and since $s^- \leq d$ (resp. $d \leq |P|$ and $\mathbf{4} \geq m$) then $D_1 \in V(\mathcal{F}^-)$ (resp. $D_{|D|} \in V(\mathcal{F}^+)$). Since $V(D_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{D_{\mathbf{2}}\}$ (resp. $V(D_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}) \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{D_{\mathbf{2}}\}$) then $D_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ (resp. $D_{[\mathbf{2},|D|]}$) is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ (resp $\mathcal{F}^+$).

□

Thus splitting W at position $\text{pos}(P_d)$ give us some nice properties. Nevertheless, splitting the free zone in two is not sufficient to define dominant tiles. Indeed, we have to deal with two other problems. The first one is that the hypothesis $P_d - \overrightarrow{v} \notin V(\mathcal{F}^-)$ is required to prove that P_d belongs to a pumpable segment. Nevertheless a second problem occurs with only this condition: the pumping of this candidate segment could collide with $P_{[s^+,d]}$ which is troublesome for our proof. The good definition of a dominant tile is the following (see Figure 110).

Definition 7.31. Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$, W be its window and consider a coherent indexing of this window. Consider $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ and a good path C of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$, the tile P_d is *dominant* due to path C if and only if $C_1 = \text{pos}(P_d)$, $C^{+\omega}$ splits $\mathcal{F}$ into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$ and $C - \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$.

Remark that no tile of $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ could be dominant. We start by a preliminary result: a dominant tile always belongs to a dual segment of W according the decomposition of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs whereas the translation of a dominant tile by $-\overrightarrow{v}$ belongs to an arc of the decomposition.

Lemma 7.32. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$, let $n = s^+ - s^-$, let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$. Consider $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ such that P_d is a dominant tile and consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in $\mathcal{F}$ then there exists $1 \leq j \leq k \leq \ell$ such that $\text{pos}(P_d) \in V(D^k) \setminus \{D^k_1, D^k_{|D^k|}\}$ and $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(A^j)$.*

Proof. Let C such that P_d is dominant due to path C, let W be the window of the free zone, and consider a coherent indexing of W. By lemma 7.27, the sequence of arcs $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is equivalent to the decomposition of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ into extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and by lemma 7.30, there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |D|$ such that $D_{\mathbf{2}} = \text{pos}(P_d)$. Then if there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ such that $\text{pos}(P_d) \in V(A^k)$ then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} - \overrightarrow{v} = P_d$ and thus $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}}) = C_{|C|}$ which contradicts the definition of a split. Then there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ such that $\text{pos}(P_d) \in V(D^k) \setminus \{D^k_1, D^k_{|D^k|}\}$. Now, by definition of a dominant tile, $C - \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ and then $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(\mathcal{F}^-)$. By lemma 5.4, there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ such that G^I is the interior of arc A^j and $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(G^I)$ (see Figure 111). Thus, either $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(A^j)$ or $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(G^I) \setminus V(A^j)$. In the second case (see Figure 111a), since $C - \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ then there exists $2 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |C|$ such that $C_{\mathbf{3}} - \overrightarrow{v} \in A^j$ then $C_{\mathbf{3}} \in \text{dom}(P)$ which contradicts the definition of a split. Then $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(A^j)$. Now, remark that if A^j is not a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ then A^j would intersect with $C^{+\omega}$ and in this case, P intersects with $C^{*+\omega}$ which is a contradiction. Thus, A^j is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ and then $j \leq k$ (see Figure 111b).

□

Now, we show that a dominant tile belongs to a good pumpable segment of the fork build by lemma 7.25. In fact, we are interested only in lemma 7.35 but we decompose the proof in a sequence of three lemmas (see Figure 112 for an illustration of these lemmas).

Lemma 7.33. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$, let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$. Consider $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ and a good path C such that P_d is a dominant tile due to path C whose extension $C^{+\omega}$ splits $\mathcal{F}$ into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then either P is fragile or there exists a fork F and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$ such that:*

- *the underlying path of F is D;*
- *$F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$;*
- *$F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$.*

Proof. Let W be the window of the free zone and consider a coherent indexing of W. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$ and consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$.

By lemma 7.27, this decomposition is equivalent to the one of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. By lemma 7.32, there exist $1 \leq j \leq k \leq \ell$ such that $\text{pos}(P_d) \in V(D^k)$ and $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(A^j)$. Then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |D|$ such that $D_{\mathbf{1}} = \text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v}$ and $D_{\mathbf{2}} = \text{pos}(P_d)$. By lemma 7.25, either P is fragile or pumpable or there exists a fork F such that the binding graph of F is D. Now, since $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then either P is fragile or $F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$. Also, since by definition of a fork, the path assembly $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F + \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then either P is fragile or $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_d - \overrightarrow{v}$ then $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$.

□

Lemma 7.34. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$, let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$. Consider $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ and a good path C such that P_d is a dominant tile due to path C whose extension $C^{+\omega}$ splits $\mathcal{F}$ into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then either P is fragile or there exists a fork F and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$ such that:*

- *the underlying path of F is D;*
- *$F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$;*
- *$F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$;*
- *the underlying path of $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$.*

Proof. Let W be the window of the free zone and consider a coherent indexing of W. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$ and consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$. By lemma 7.27, this decomposition is equivalent to the one of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and by lemma 7.21, this decomposition is positive. By lemma 7.33, either P is fragile or there exists a fork F and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$ such that the underlying path of F is D; $F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$ and $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. By definition of a fork, $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$. For the sake of contradiction suppose that the underlying path of $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is not a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{4} = \min\{i \geq \mathbf{1} : (D_i, D_{i+1}) + \overrightarrow{v} \notin E(\mathcal{F}^+)\}$ such that $\mathbf{4} < \mathbf{2}$. Let W' be the window of $\mathcal{F}^+$, we consider an indexing of W' such that $W'_0 = \text{pos}(P_d)$ and $W'_{|C|-1} = C_{|C|}$, then $\mathcal{F}^+$ is the right side of W'. Now, we proceed in three steps to conclude this part of the proof, first we show that $\mathbf{4} > 1$, then we show that there exists an edge of C which is strictly on the right side of $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ and then we conclude.

Case $\mathbf{4} = \mathbf{1}$: for the sake of contradiction, suppose that $\mathbf{4} = \mathbf{1}$. Then, we consider a local reasoning around tile P_d which has four neighbors: C_2, P_{d+1}, P_{d-1} and $D_{\mathbf{1}+1} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Since P is simple then $\text{pos}(P_{d+1}) \neq \text{pos}(P_{d-1})$. By definition of a split, we have $C_2 \neq \text{pos}(P_{d+1})$ and $C_2 \neq \text{pos}(P_{d-1})$. Now if $D_{\mathbf{1}+1} + \overrightarrow{v} = C_2$ or $D_{\mathbf{1}+1} + \overrightarrow{v} = \text{pos}(P_{d+1})$ then the edge $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1}) + \overrightarrow{v}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}^+$. Finally, if $D_{\mathbf{1}+1} + \overrightarrow{v} = \text{pos}(P_{d-1})$ then there exists $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{5} < |A^j|$ such that $A^j_{\mathbf{5}} = \text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v}$ and $A^j_{\mathbf{5}+1} = \text{pos}(P_{d-1}) - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the arc A^j is negative which is a contradiction. Now, without loss of generality we suppose that $C_2 = C_1 + (0, 1)$. Now, since (C_1, C_2) is on the left side of $P_{[d-1,d+1]}$ and since $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is in $\mathcal{F}^-$ then there exists only one possibility to satisfies all these constraints (see Figure 113a): $\text{pos}(P_{d-1}) = \text{pos}(P_d) - (0, 1)$, $\text{pos}(P_{d+1}) = \text{pos}(P_d) + (1, 0)$ and $D_{\mathbf{1}+1} + \overrightarrow{v} = \text{pos}(P_d) - (1, 0)$. In this case, the edge $(D_{\mathbf{1}}, D_{\mathbf{1}+1}) + \overrightarrow{v}$ is not an edge of the underlying path of P and then

there exists $\mathbf{6}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{6}} = \text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} = D_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $W_{\mathbf{6}+1} = D_{\mathbf{1}+1}$. Moreover there exists $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ such that the edge $(W_{\mathbf{6}}, W_{\mathbf{6}+1})$ belong to $E(D^k)$. Then two cases occur (see Figure 113a), if $W_{\mathbf{6}-1} \neq C_2 - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the edge $(C_1, C_2) - \overrightarrow{v}$ is strictly on the right side of $W_{[\mathbf{6}-1,\mathbf{6}+1]}$ and is not an edge of $E(\mathcal{F})$, which is a contradiction. Now if $W_{\mathbf{6}-1} = C_2 - \overrightarrow{v}$ then the edge $(\text{pos}(P_d), \text{pos}(P_{d+1})) - \overrightarrow{v}$ is strictly on the left side of $W_{[\mathbf{6}-1,\mathbf{6}+1]}$ and thus to the free zone $\mathcal{F}$. Moreover, since the arc A^k is positive by lemma 7.21 then it starts in $W_{\mathbf{7}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{8}}$ such that $\mathbf{7} \leq \mathbf{6}$ and $\mathbf{8} > \mathbf{6}$. This remark contradicts the fact that the edge $(W_{\mathbf{6}}, W_{\mathbf{6}+1})$ belongs to $E(D^k)$. Then $\mathbf{4} > \mathbf{1}$.

An edge of C is strictly on the right side of $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$: see Figure 113b for an illustration of this part of the proof. Now, if $\mathbf{4} > 1$ then since $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{4}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ then there exist $\mathbf{11} > 0$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{11}} = D_{\mathbf{4}} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Now, let $\mathbf{12} = \max\{i < \mathbf{4} : D_i + \overrightarrow{v} \in V(W'_{[-\infty,0]})\}$ and let $\mathbf{9} \leq 0$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{9}} = D_{\mathbf{12}}$. Now, let $\mathbf{13}$ such that $D_{[\mathbf{12},\mathbf{13}]}$ is the extremum path extracted from $D_{[\mathbf{12},\mathbf{4}]}$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{11} < \mathbf{10}$ such that $W'_{\mathbf{10}} = D_{\mathbf{13}} + \overrightarrow{v}$ and there exists $0 < \mathbf{13}$ such that $C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}} = W'_{\mathbf{10}}$. Remark that $D_{\mathbf{4}+1} \notin W'_{[-\infty,\mathbf{9}]}$ then and thus by lemma 5.26 then the edge $(C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}}, C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}+1})$ is strictly on the right side of $D_{[\mathbf{13}-1,\mathbf{13}+1]} + \overrightarrow{v}$.

Conclusion: since there exists $\mathbf{14} > 0$ such that the edge $(C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}}, C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}+1})$ is strictly on the right side of $D_{[\mathbf{13}-1,\mathbf{13}+1]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ and by definition of D there exists $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that $D_{\mathbf{13}} \in A^i$ or $D_{\mathbf{13}} \in D^i \setminus \{D^i_1, D^i_{|D^i|}\}$. In the first case, since $D_{\mathbf{13}} \in \text{dom}(P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ and $D_{\mathbf{13}} + \overrightarrow{v} = C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}}$ then this fact contradicts the definition of a split. In the second case, if $\mathbf{14} > |C|$ then $C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}} - \overrightarrow{v} \in \text{dom}(P)$ and $C^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{14}} - \overrightarrow{v} = C_{\mathbf{14}-|C|+1}$ which contradicts the definition of a split. Thus $\mathbf{14} \leq |C|$ and in this case, the edge $(C_{\mathbf{14}}, C_{\mathbf{14}+1})$ is strictly on the right side of $D_{[\mathbf{13}-1,\mathbf{13}+1]} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Thus, since $D_{\mathbf{13}} \in D^i \setminus \{D^i_1, D^i_{|D^i|}\}$ then $(C_{\mathbf{14}}, C_{\mathbf{14}+1}) - \overrightarrow{v}$ is on the right side of W (and then not in $E(\mathcal{F})$) which contradicts the definition of a dominant tile.

□

Lemma 7.35. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$, let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$. Consider $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ and a good path C such that P_d is a dominant tile due to path C whose extension $C^{+\omega}$ splits $\mathcal{F}$ into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. Then either P is fragile or there exists a fork F and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$ such that:*

- *the underlying path of F is D;*
- *$F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$;*
- *$F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a good candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$;*
- *the underlying path of $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$.*

Proof. See Figure 112 for an illustration of this part of the proof. By lemma 7.34, either P is fragile or there exists a fork F and $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$ such that the underlying path of F is D; $F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$; $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and the underlying path of $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$. By lemma 7.30, the path $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ and $V(D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(C^{+\omega}) = \{\text{pos}(P_d)\}$. Thus $V(D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}) = \{\text{pos}(P_d)\}$ and $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a good candidate segment of F. □

Now we show that either a candidate segment of P is pumpable or there exists $d' > d$ such that $P_{d'}$ is dominant.

Lemma 7.36. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$. Consider $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ such that P_d is dominant. Then either there exists $s^- \leq \mathbf{1} \leq d \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a pumpable segment of P or there exists $d < d' \leq |P|$ such that $P_{d'}$ is dominant or P is fragile.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P and W be its window. Let $n = s^+ - s^-$, $m = |P| - s^-$ and $\mathbf{3}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{3}} = P_d$. Consider C such that P_d is dominant due to path C. The direction of C is $\overrightarrow{v}$ and $C^{+\omega}$ splits $\mathcal{F}$ into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$. Let D be the trajectory of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. By lemma 7.35, either P is fragile or there exists a fork F such that the binding graph of F is D and there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |F|$ such that $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a good candidate segment of F of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$, such that $F_{\mathbf{2}} = P_d$ and such that $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$. By applying lemma 5.32 either $D^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$ or there exists R and indices $\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- R is a good path of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $R_1 = C_1$ and $R_{|R|} = C_{|C|}$;
- $R^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$;
- $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$, $\mathbf{5} \geq |R|$ and $R^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{5}} = W_{\mathbf{4}}$ and $y_{W_{\mathbf{4}}} \geq \min\{y_C, y_{D[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}\} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$.

If the path R exists: since R is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$ then $y_R + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} + \overrightarrow{v} > y_{P_{|P|}}$, thus we have $V(R^{*+\omega}) \cap W_{[m,+\infty]} = \emptyset$. Then there exists $\mathbf{6} = \max\{i : R^{+\omega}_i \in V(W)\}$. Moreover, we have $\mathbf{6} \geq \mathbf{5} \geq |R|$ and since $R^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{6}} \in \mathcal{F}^+$ then there exists $d < d' \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{d'}) = R^{+\omega}_{\mathbf{6}}$. Let $C' = R_{[\mathbf{6},\mathbf{6}+|R|-1]}$. By definition of $\mathbf{6}$ and R, the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ is split at position $W_{\mathbf{6}} = \text{pos}(P_{d'})$ by $C'^{+\omega}$ into $(\mathcal{F}'^-, \mathcal{F}'^+)$. Note that since $R_1 = \text{pos}(P_d)$ with $d < d'$ then $R_1 \in V(\mathcal{F}^-)$. Moreover, since $R_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ is a path of $\mathcal{F}$ and since $V(R_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}) \cap V(C'^{+\omega}) = \{R_{\mathbf{6}}\}$ then $R_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}'^-$ and since $\mathbf{6} \geq |R|$ then $C' - \overrightarrow{v} = R_{[\mathbf{6}-|R|+1,\mathbf{6}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}'^-$. Thus $P_{d'}$ is a dominant tile and the lemma is true.

If $D^{*+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$: in this case by lemma 7.16 and since $D_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a good candidate segment, then the path assembly $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot F^{+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$,*i.e.* the segment $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is pumpable in $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$. Now, consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ of $P_{[s^+,|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$. By lemma 7.27, this decomposition is equivalent to the one of $W_{[n,+\infty]} - \overrightarrow{v}$. By lemma 7.21, this decomposition is positive. By lemma 7.32, there exists $1 \leq k < \ell$ such that $\text{pos}(P_d) \in V(D^k)$ and there exists $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that $D_{\mathbf{1}} \in V(A^j)$. Now we consider two different cases: $j = k$ and $j < k$.

Subcase if $j = k$: see Figure 114b for a graphical representation of this case. Since $\text{pos}(P_d) \in V(D^k)$ then there exists $\mathbf{8} \leq d$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{8}}) = D^k_1$. Moreover, since A^k is positive and since $\text{pos}(P_d) - \overrightarrow{v} \in V(A^k)$ then there exists $\mathbf{9} \geq d$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{9}}) - \overrightarrow{v} = A^k_{|A^k|} = D^k_1 = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{8}})$. Now, let $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{7} \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that $D_{\mathbf{7}} = A^k_{|A^k|} = D^k_1$ and since $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F + \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then either P is fragile or $P_{[d,\mathbf{9}]} = F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{7}]} + \overrightarrow{v}$. Thus $P^{+\omega}_{[\mathbf{8},\mathbf{9}]}$ is a sub-assembly of $F^{+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$. Since $\text{dom}(P_{[s^-,\mathbf{8}]}) \subset \mathcal{F}^-$ then $P_{[1,\mathbf{8}]} \cdot P^{+\omega}_{[\mathbf{8},\mathbf{9}]}$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and then the segment $P_{[\mathbf{8},\mathbf{9}]}$ of P is pumpable.

Subcase if $j < k$: see Figure 114a for a graphical representation of this part of the proof. Now, let $n = \mathbf{2} - \mathbf{1}$ and $Q = D^{+\omega}_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ then $Q_{[1,n]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$, $Q_{[n,+\infty]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$ and $y_{Q_{[n,+\infty]}} = y_{F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} + \overrightarrow{v} > y_{P_{|P|}}$, then we have $V(Q) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) = \emptyset$. If $j < k$ then let $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{10} \leq \mathbf{2}$ such $D_{\mathbf{10}} = A^k_{|A^k|}$, then there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{11} \leq |P|$ such that $D_{\mathbf{10}} + \overrightarrow{v} = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{11}})$. Moreover, since the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ is positive then $d < \mathbf{11}$ and then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{11}}) \in \mathcal{F}^+$. Thus, $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{11}}) \in V(Q_{[n+1,\infty]})$. Now, since $V(Q) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) = \emptyset$ then there exists $\mathbf{12} \geq n$ such that $Q_{\mathbf{12}} = \max\{i : Q_i \in V(W)\}$. Moreover since $\mathbf{11} > d$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{11}}) \in V(Q_{[n+1,\infty]})$ then $\mathbf{12} > n$. Now, since $V(Q) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) = \emptyset$ and $Q_{\mathbf{12}} \in \mathcal{F}^+$ then there exists $d < d' < |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{d'}) = Q_{\mathbf{12}}$. Then, let $C' = Q_{[\mathbf{12},\mathbf{12}+n]}$ be a path of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. By definition of $\mathbf{12}$ and Q, the free zone $\mathcal{F}$ is split at position $\text{pos}(P_{d'})$ by $C'^{+\omega}$ into $(\mathcal{F}'^-, \mathcal{F}'^+)$. Note that since $Q_n = P_d$ with $d < d'$ then $Q_n \in V(\mathcal{F}'^-)$. Moreover, since $Q_{[1,\mathbf{12}]}$ is a path of $\mathcal{F}$ and since $V(Q_{[1,\mathbf{12}]}) \cap V(C'^{+\omega}) = \{Q_{\mathbf{12}}\}$ then $Q_{[1,\mathbf{12}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}'^-$ and since $\mathbf{12} > n$ then $C' - \overrightarrow{v} = Q_{[\mathbf{12}-n,\mathbf{12}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}'^-$. Thus $P_{d'}$ is a dominant tile and the lemma is true.

□

Finally, we prove that there exists at least one dominant tile in a path assembly which does a U-turn.

Lemma 7.37. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Then there exists, $s^+ \leq d \leq |P|$ such that P_d is dominant.*

Proof. This proof is in three parts. In the first one, we define an infinite path which will be useful to split the free zone. In the second part, we show that this path is indeed a subgraph of the free zone. In the last part, we show that the last intersection between this path and $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$ is a dominant tile. See Figure 115 for an illustration of this proof.

Definition: let $\overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{P_{s^-}P_{s^+}}$, let $\mathcal{F}$ be the free zone of P associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and W be its window, let $p = x_{\overrightarrow{v}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. Consider a coherent indexing of this window. Consider the height function h of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. Let $H = \max\{h(\text{pos}(P_i)) : s^- \leq i \leq |P| \text{ and } y_{P_i} \geq y_{P_{s^-}}\}$. Let (D^H, U^H) be the the cut of the grid by the line of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and height H and let L^H be its window. Now, since the height of P_{s^-} is less than H then the infinite line $W_{[-\infty,0]}$ intersects with L^H. Consider an indexing of L^H such that $L^H_0 \in W_{[-m,0]}$, $L^H_1 \notin W_{[-m,0]}$ and $L^H_p = L^H_0 + \overrightarrow{v}$. Now, let

$$H' = \max\{h(\text{pos}(P_i)) : s^- \leq i \leq |P| \text{ and there exists } k \geq 0 \text{ such that } y_{P_i} = y_{P_{s^-}} + k y_{\overrightarrow{v}}\}.$$

By definition $H' \leq H$. Now, we define the path R as follow: we definite the positions A and B such that $y_A = y_{P_{s^-}}$ and $h(A) = H'$ and $B = A + (0, 1)$ then R is the concatenation of the four paths $R^1 \cdot R^2 \cdot R^3 \cdot R^4$ defined as:

- R^1 is the path such that $R^1_1 = L^H_0$, $R^1_{|R^1|} = A$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq |R^1| - 1$, we have $R^1_{i+1} = R^1_i + (1, 0)$;
- R^2 is the path from A to B (R^2 is made of two vertices and one edges);

- R^3 is the path such that $R^3_1 = B$, $R^3_{|R^3|} = L^H_1$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq |R^1| - 1$, we have $R^3_{i+1} = R^3_i - (1,0)$;
- R^4 is the path $L^H_{[1,p]}$.

The path $R^{+\omega}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$: If $L^H_{[0,+\infty]}$ is a not subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ then there exists $s^- \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $h(\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}})) > H$ and $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} > P_{s^-}$ which contradicts the definition of H. Now if $R^{+\omega}$ is not a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ then there exists $s^- \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and $k \geq 0$ such that $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} = y_{P_{s^-}} + k y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ and $x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} > x_A + k x_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ which contradicts the definition of H'.

There exists a dominant tile: let $Q = R^{+\omega}$, by definition of R and H' there exists an index $\mathbf{3} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \geq 0$ such that $Q_{\mathbf{3}} \in \text{dom}(P_{[s^-,|P|]})$ and $y_{Q_{\mathbf{3}}} = y_{P_{s^-}} + k\overrightarrow{v}$. Note that if $k = 0$ then since P_{s^-} is visible from the west, we have $Q_{\mathbf{3}} = \text{pos}(P_{s^-})$. In this case, $Q_{\mathbf{3}+|R|-1} = P_{s^+}$ and then we can suppose that $k > 0$ and that $\mathbf{3} \geq |R|$. Remark that $V(Q_{[|R|,+\infty]}) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) = \emptyset$ otherwise we would have $y_{P_{|P|}} \geq y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ which contradicts the definition of a U-turn. Now, let $\mathbf{4} = \max\{i : Q_i \in V(W_{[0,+\infty]})\}$. By definition $\mathbf{4} \geq \mathbf{3} \geq |R|$ and then $y_{Q_{\mathbf{4}}} \geq y_{P_{s^+}}$. Also, since $V(Q_{[|R|,+\infty]}) \cap V(W_{[m,+\infty]}) = \emptyset$, there exists $s^- \leq d \leq |P|$ such that $P_d = Q_{\mathbf{4}}$. Now if $d < s^+$ then let (G_1, G_2) be the cut of the grid by the underlying path of $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ whose extremities are both visible from the west and let W' be its window. Consider an indexing of W' coherent with $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and suppose that G_1 is the left side of W', thus G_1 is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$. Then $Q_{\mathbf{4}}$ belongs to G_1. Moreover, since $y_{Q_{\mathbf{4}}} \geq y_{s^+}$, since $Q_{\mathbf{4}} \neq \text{pos}(P_{s^+})$ and since Q is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ then $Q_{[\mathbf{4},+\infty]}$ is a subgraph of G_1. But $Y_{G_1} = Y_{P_{[s^-,s^+]}}$ is finite which contradicts the definition of Q. Then, $d \geq s^+$ and let $C = Q_{[\mathbf{4},\mathbf{4}+|R|-1]}$. Since Q is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ and by definition of $\mathbf{4}$, then $C^{+\omega}$ splits the free zone into $(\mathcal{F}^-, \mathcal{F}^+)$. Moreover $Q_{[0,\mathbf{4}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ such that $Q_0 \in W_{[-\infty,0]}$ and then $Q_{[0,\mathbf{4}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$. Since $\mathbf{4} \geq |R|$ then $C - \overrightarrow{v} = Q_{[\mathbf{4}-|R|+1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ and thus P_d is a dominant tile.

□

Finally, we can prove the final result of this section.

Lemma 7.38. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. If P makes a U-turn then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Consider two indices $1 \leq s^- < s^+ < |P|$ such that P does a U-turn at indices s^- and s^+. Consider the set $R = \{s^+ \leq i \leq |P| : P_i \text{ is dominant }\}$ which contains the indices of the dominant tiles of P, by lemma 7.37 this set is not empty. Consider $d = \max\{i : i \in R\}$ the last dominant tile of P, by lemma 7.36 either P is fragile or there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq d \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a pumpable segment of P or there exists $d' \in R$ such that $d' > d$. Since the last case is not possible, then P is fragile or pumpable. □

8 From microscopic reasoning to macroscopic one: proof of the remaining macroscopic lemmas

The aim of the last section of the proof is to prove the last three remaining macroscopic lemma. We proceed in this order: the seed lemma, the reset lemma, the stakes lemma. This section

used several bounds and functions which are all defined in the appendix A. The figures of this section are in Appendix G.

8.1 The seed lemma

To prove the existence of a U-turn in an exposed path assembly P, we need to verify two hypothesis: there exists a visible candidate segment and the last tile of P is low enough. For the second hypothesis if there exists a visible candidate segment and if $y_P = y_{P_{|P|}}$ then P does a U-turn.

Lemma 8.1. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if there exists a visible candidate segment in P and if $y_{P_{|P|}} = y_P$ then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Consider $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$. By lemma 7.10, $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} > 0$. Now, remark that $y_{P_{|P|}} = y_P \leq y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} < y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$. Thus the path assembly P makes a U-turn and by lemma 7.38, P is fragile or pumpable. □

Now, suppose that we have found a candidate segment in an exposed path assembly. Then this candidate segment may be oriented to the south, we deal with this problem now.

Lemma 8.2. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if there exists $1 \leq s^- \leq s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment, visible from the west, not hidden by the seed, directed to the south and which exits to the south or the east, then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. See Figure 132 for an illustration of this proof. Let s be the first lowest tile of P and t be the first highest of P, by definition we have $s \leq t$. Since P_{s^-} is visible from the west, not hidden by the seed and oriented to the south, then by lemma 7.12, P_s is visible from the west and exits to the east. Also by lemma 7.9, we have $y_{P_{s^-}} \geq y_{P_{s^+}} \geq y_{P_s}$ and $s^- \leq s^+ \leq s$ and by lemmas 7.11 and 7.12, we have $y_{P_s} = y_P < y_\sigma$. By definition of t, we have $y_{P_t} > P_{[1,s]}$ Now consider $\mathcal{T}' = (T', \sigma', 1)$ where T' is the tile set obtained by switching the north and south glues of the tiles of T and σ' is obtained by a symmetry of σ according to the x axis. Let Q be the path assembly obtained by a symmetry of $P_{[1,t]}$ by the the x axis. Then Q is fragile or pumpable if and only if P is fragile or pumpable. Remark that $Q_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of Q, that Q_s is the first highest tile of Q, that Q_s exits to the east and that $y_{Q_s} > Y_{\sigma'}$. Moreover $y_{Q_{|Q|}} = y_{Q_t} < \min\{y_\sigma, y_{Q_{[1,s]}}\}$ and then the tail of Q is long and by lemma 7.13, there exists $\mathbf{1} > s$ such that $Q_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ is an exposed path assembly with $y_{Q_\mathbf{1}} = y_{Q_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}}$. Since $s^- \leq s^+ \leq s$ then $Q_{[s^-,,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment of $Q_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ and then by lemma 8.1, Q is fragile or pumpable and then P is fragile or pumpable.

□

Lemma 8.3. *Consider a path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, if $Y_P - Y_{|\sigma|} > 4|T|$ (resp. $X_P - X_{|\sigma|} > 4|T|$) and $y_{|\sigma|} - y_P > 4|T|$ and (resp. $x_{|\sigma|} - x_P > 4|T|$) then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. This proof relies on using symmetries in order to find a U-turn in P, Figures 136 and 137 represent an example where all symmetries are required. First, if $X_P - X_{|\sigma|} > 4|T|$ and $x_{|\sigma|} - x_P > 4|T|$ then by switching the abscissa and the ordinate axis, we can consider, without

loss of generality, that $Y_P - Y_{|\sigma|} > 4|T|$ and $y_{|\sigma|} - y_P > 4|T|$. Now, let $\mathbf{1} = \min\{1 \leq i \leq |P| : y_{P_i} > Y_{|\sigma|} + 4|T| \text{ or } y_{P_i} < y_{|\sigma|} - 4|T|\}$. Secondly, if $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} < y_{|\sigma|} - 4|T|$ then by switching north and south (*i.e* by a symmetry of the x axis), we can consider, without loss of generality, that $y_{P_\mathbf{1}} - Y_{|\sigma|} > 4|T|$. Now, by hypothesis there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathbf{3} = \min\{\mathbf{1} \leq i \leq |P| : y_{P_i} < y_{|\sigma|} - 4|T|\}$. Now, let t be the first highest tile of $P_{[1,\mathbf{3}]}$, note that we have $\mathbf{1} \leq t < \mathbf{3}$. Thirdly, if P_t is oriented to the west then by switching west and east (*i.e* by a symmetry of the y axis), we can consider, without loss of generality, that P_t is oriented to the east. Remark that P has a long tail and then by lemma 7.13, there exists $t \leq \mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3}$ such $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ is an exposed path assembly with $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} = y_{P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}}$. Since $y_{P_t} - Y_{|\sigma|} > 4|T|$, there exists at least $4|T|$ tiles visible from the west and not hidden by the seed in $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$. Then there $1 \leq s^- \leq s^+ \leq t$ such that the segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ is visible from the west, not hidden by the seed, directed to the north or to the south and exits to north, south or west. If $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is oriented to the south then by lemma 8.2, P is fragile or pumpable (Figure 137). Now, if $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is oriented to the north then by lemma 8.1, P is fragile or pumpable (Figure 136).

□

To conclude this section, consider a path assembly with macroscopic initial condition then if $\text{dom}(\sigma)$ is not a subset of $\mathcal{R}^\sigma$. Then either $y_{|\sigma|} - y_P > 4|T|$ or $x_{|\sigma|} - x_P > 4|T|$. W.l.o.g. we consider that $y_{|\sigma|} - y_P > 4|T|$ and by definition of a path assembly with good macroscopic condition, we have $Y_P - Y_\sigma \geq y_{|\sigma|} - y_P > 4|T|$ and by lemma 8.3, P is fragile or pumpable. The seed lemma is thus a corollary of this result.

8.2 Reset lemma

To prove the reset lemma, we assume that the path assembly will grow a lot to the north and then will come back near the seed. Then, we are able to find a lot of tiles visible from the west. The first step is to show that almost all of them are oriented to the north. Then, we can find a type of tile which appears frequently among the tiles visible from the west which allow us to find a candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $y_{\overrightarrow{v}}$ is big enough to find a U-turn.

Lemma 8.4. *Consider an exposed path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. If $Y_P - y_P > |\sigma| + 2(y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 3)|T|$ then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. See Figure 133 for an illustration of this proof. By fact 7.1, we have $\mathcal{V}^P > |\sigma| + 2(y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 3)|T|$ and since at most $|\sigma|$ tiles of P are hidden by the seed then $\mathcal{V}^P_\sigma > 2(y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 3)|T|$. Now if more than $2|T|$ of these tiles are directed to the south then there exists $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment, visible from the west, not hidden by the seed, directed to the south and exits to the south or east. In this case, by lemma 8.2, P is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise there exists at least $2(y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 2)|T|$ tiles visible from the west and directed to the north. Then there exists $o \in T$ such that there exists at least $y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 2$ tiles of P which are of type o, oriented to the north and either all of them exit to the east or all of them exit to the north. Then, there exists $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ and such that $|y_{\overrightarrow{v}}| \geq y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 1$. Moreover by lemma 7.9, $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} > 0$ and then $y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 1$. Thus $y_{P_{[s^-,|P|]}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq y_P + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq y_P + y_{P_{|P|}} - y_P + 1 > y_{P_{|P|}}$. Then P makes a U-turn and by lemma 7.38, P is fragile or pumpable.

□

Consider $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the window associated to the rectangle $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ is defined as the finite cycle $C = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq 4} Q^i$ where:

- Q^1 is the path starting in $(0,0)$ and ending in $(0,\ell)$ with for all $1 \leq i \leq |Q^1| - 1$, we have $Q^1_{i+1} = Q^1_i + (0,1)$;
- Q^2 is the path starting in $(0,\ell)$ and ending in (ℓ,ℓ) with for all $1 \leq i \leq |Q^2| - 1$, we have $Q^2_{i+1} = Q^2_i + (1,0)$;
- Q^3 is the path starting in (ℓ,ℓ) and ending in $(\ell,0)$ with for all $1 \leq i \leq |Q^3| - 1$, we have $Q^3_{i+1} = Q^3_i + (0,-1)$;
- Q^4 is the path starting in $(\ell,0)$ and ending in $(0,0)$ with for all $1 \leq i \leq |Q^4| - 1$, we have $Q^4_{i+1} = Q^4_i + (-1,0)$.

Let G^I be the interior of C then $V(G^I) = \mathcal{R}(\ell)$. Remark that $V(C) \leq 4\ell$. For the definition of the function f^s and f^r since the appendix A. To demonstrate the reset lemma, we show that a path which goes out of the square $\mathcal{R}(f^r(\ell))$ and then enter $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ afterwards is either pumpable or fragile by the previous lemma or admits a subpath with almost the same properties but which intersects the window of rectangle $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ one less time. Then a recurrence leads to the desired result. The following lemma is the proof of one step of the recurrence.

Lemma 8.5. *Consider a simple path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ such that $\mathrm{dom}(P) \cap \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) = \mathrm{pos}(P_1)$ and $\mathrm{dom}(P)$ and $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$ belong to the first quadrant of the plane. Consider $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such $\ell_2 \geq \ell_1$ and $\ell_3 \geq f^s(\ell_2 + 1)$. Suppose that $\mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$ then if there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell_3)$ and $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$ then either P is pumpable or fragile or there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3}$ such that $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{1}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell^2)$ and $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell^1)$. Moreover, let C be the window of $\mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$, then $|\mathrm{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(C)| < |\mathrm{dom}(P) \cap V(C)|$.*

Proof. See Figure 134 for an illustration of this proof. Since $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell_3)$ then either $x_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} > \ell_3$ or $y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} > \ell_3$. If $x_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} > \ell_3$ then by switching the x and y axis we are in the case $y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} > \ell_3$. Then without loss of generality, we can consider that $y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} > \ell_3$. Since $\mathrm{pos}(P_{\mathbf{4}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$ then there exists an index $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{6} \leq \mathbf{4}$ such that $\mathbf{6} = \min\{\mathbf{3} \leq i \leq |P| : P_i \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)\}$. Moreover, $P_{\mathbf{6}} \in V(C)$. Let t be the first highest tile of $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ then $y_{P_t} \geq y_{P_{\mathbf{3}}} > \ell^3 > \ell^1 \geq Y_\sigma$. If P_t exits to the west then by a symmetry according to the y axis, we are in a case where P_t exits to east and P and σ are in the second quadrant of the proof (the important hypothesis which is "$y_P \geq 0$ and $y_\sigma \geq 0$" is preserved). Then, without loss of generality we can consider that P_t exits to the east. Now, since $P_{\mathbf{6}} \in \mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$ then there exists $t \leq \mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{6}$ such that $y_{\mathbf{5}} = \ell_2 + 1$ and $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[t,\mathbf{6}]}$. Moreover since $\ell_2 > \ell_1 \geq Y_\sigma$ then $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ is not hidden by the seed. Then either $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}$ or not. If $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}$ then $P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}$ is an exposed path assembly then since $\ell_3 \geq f^s(\ell_2 + 1)$ then $\ell_3 \geq |\sigma| + 2((\ell_2 + 1) + 3)|T|$ and since $y_P > 0$ we have $\ell_3 - y_P \geq |\sigma| + 2((\ell_2 + 1) - y_P + 3)|T|$ and by definition of t and $\mathbf{5}$, we have $Y_{P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}} - y_P \geq |\sigma| + 2(y_{P_{\mathbf{5}}} - y_P + 3)|T|$. Then, by lemma 8.4, $P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}$ is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ is not visible from the west in $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ and there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq t$ such that $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} = y_{P_{\mathbf{5}}}$ and $x_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} > x_{P_{\mathbf{5}}}$. In this case, $P_{\mathbf{1}} \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell_2)$. Now let Q be the underlying path of $P_{[t,\mathbf{6}]}$ remark that by the definition of t, Q_1 is visible from the north and by the definition of $\mathbf{6}$, $Q_{|Q|}$ is visible from the south in Q. Then let (C^+, C^-) be the cut defined by Q with visible extremities and let W be its window. Consider a coherent indexing of this window. Now, remark that $P_{t-1} = P_t - (0,1)$

and $P_{t+1} = P_t + (1,0)$ and then $\text{pos}(P_{t-1}) \in V(C^-) \setminus V(W)$ (where C^- is the right side of the cut of the grid). Now for all $k > 1$, the position $(x_{P_\mathbf{5}} + k, y_{P_\mathbf{5}})$ is not a vertex of $V(W)$, otherwise it would either contradict the definition of P_t or the fact that $P_\mathbf{5}$ is visible from the east in $P_{[t,\mathbf{6}]}$. Then all these tiles belong to C^+ and then $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{1}) \in V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$. Then there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq t-1$ such that $\mathbf{2} \in V(W)$. Since P is simple and by definition of t, we have $x_{P_\mathbf{2}} = x_{P_\mathbf{6}}$ and $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} < y_{P_\mathbf{6}}$. Since $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{6}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$ then $x_{P_\mathbf{6}} \leq \ell_1$ and $y_{P_\mathbf{6}} \leq \ell_1$. Then $x_{P_\mathbf{2}} \leq \ell_1$ and $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} \leq \ell_1$ and by hypothesis $x_{P_\mathbf{2}} \geq 0$ and $y_{P_\mathbf{2}} \geq 0$. Then $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{1}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell_1)$. Thus $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ satisfies the desired conditions of the lemma. Moreover since $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{6}$ and $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{6}) \in V(C)$ then $|\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(C)| < |\text{dom}(P) \cap V(C)|$.

□

Using lemma 8.5 to do a recurrence on a path assembly with macroscopic initial conditions leads to the reset lemma. We present here the reset lemma in a more general setting.

Lemma 8.6. *Consider a simple path assembly P producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ such that $\text{dom}(P) \cap \text{dom}(\sigma) = \text{pos}(P_1)$ and both $\text{dom}(P)$ and $\text{dom}(\sigma)$ belong to the first quadrant of the plane. Consider $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$. If P does not satisfy the reset constraint for $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ then P is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. Let $\ell_0 = f^s(\ell + 1)$ and for $0 \leq i \leq 4\ell - 1$, let $\ell_{i+1} = f^s(\ell_i + 1)$. Consider the following hypothesis $H(i)$:"either P is fragile or pumpable or there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{1}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell_{4\ell-i})$ and $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{2}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ and $|\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}) \cap V(C)| \leq |\text{dom}(P) \cap V(C)| - i$". By hypothesis, since P does not satisfy the reset constraint for $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$ then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{1}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^r(\ell))$ and $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{2}) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)$. Since $f^r(\ell) = \ell_{4\ell}$ then $H(0)$ is true. Now suppose that $H(i)$ is true for $i \leq 4\ell - 1$ then either P is fragile or pumpable (then $H(i+1)$ is true) or there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ which satisfies the properties of the recurrence and in this case, by lemma 8.5, $H(i+1)$ is true. Then, $H(4\ell)$ is true and either P is fragile or pumpable or there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such $\text{pos}(P_\mathbf{1}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ and $|\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \cap V(C)| \leq |\text{dom}(P) \cap V(C)| - 4\ell \leq 0$. Since $\text{dom}(\sigma) \in \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ and $\text{pos}(P_1) \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$ then this second case is not possible and thus P is fragile or pumpable.

□

Consider a path assembly P which satisfies macroscopic initial conditions and $\ell > \mathcal{B}^\sigma$ such that P does not satisfies the reset constraint for $\mathcal{R}(\ell)$. Then if the hypothesis $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\ell)$ is not satisfied then by the seed lemma (lemma 4.7), the path assembly P is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise by lemma 8.6, the path assembly P is fragile or pumpable. Then, the variant of the reset lemma formulated in lemma 4.9 is a corollary of this result and of the seed lemma.

8.3 Stakes Lemma

The first step for proving the stakes lemma is to find a candidate segment which is *near* the seed.

Lemma 8.7. *Consider a path assembly P satisfying macroscopic initial conditions and producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. Then either P is fragile or pumpable or there exists $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq |P|$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ with $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$ and $\text{dom}(P_{[1,s^+]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v)$.*

Proof. See figure 135 for an illustration of this proof. By the seed lemma 4.7, either P is fragile or pumpable or $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma)$. Now consider P' and σ' which are the translation of P and σ by $(-\mathcal{B}, -\mathcal{B})$. Then by definition of macroscopic initial conditions P' and σ' are in the first quadrant of the plane and $\text{dom}(\sigma') \subset \mathcal{R}(8|T| + |\sigma|)$. By definition of macroscopic initial conditions, we have $y_{P_{|P|}} > \mathcal{B}^f$ and then there exists $\mathbf{1} = \min\{1 \leq i \leq |P| : y_{P'_i} > 8|T| + |\sigma|\}$ and $\mathbf{2} = \min\{\mathbf{1} \leq i \leq |P| : \text{pos}(P'_i) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B})\}$. By definition $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$. Now either $X_{P'_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}} \leq f^b(8|T| + \sigma)$ or $X_{P'_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}} > f^b(8|T| + \sigma)$. In the second case, the path assembly P' fits in a band and by lemma 6.7, P' is fragile or pumpable (and then P is also fragile or pumpable). Now, if $X_{P'_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}} \leq f^b(8|T| + \sigma)$ then $\text{dom}(P'_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^b(8|T| + \sigma))$. Now, there exists more than $4|T|$ tiles visible from the west in $P'_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$, then there exists at least $4|T|$ tiles visible from the west in $P'_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ and which belong to $\mathcal{R}(f^b(8|T| + \sigma))$. Then there $1 \leq s^- \leq s^+ \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that P_{s^-} and P_{s^+} both belong to $\mathcal{R}(f^b(8|T| + \sigma))$ and either $P'_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of $P'_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ or $P'_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a candidate segment of $P'_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$, visible from the west, oriented to the south, not hidden in the seed and which exits by the south or the east. In the second case, by lemma 8.2, P' is pumpable or fragile. In the first case, either $P'_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is also a visible candidate segment of P' or not. If $P'_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is not visible in P' then there $\mathbf{3} > \mathbf{2}$ such that $P'_{\mathbf{3}} \in \mathcal{R}(f^b(8|T| + \sigma))$. By definition $\text{pos}(P'_{\mathbf{2}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B})$ and since $\mathcal{B} = f^r(f^b(8|T| + \sigma))$, then P' does not satisfy the reset constraint for $\mathcal{R}(f^b(8|T| + \sigma))$ and by lemma 8.6, P' is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise $P'_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate of P' and $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$ and $\text{dom}(P_{[1,s^+]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B})$ and then $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate of P and $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$ and $\text{dom}(P_{[1,s^+]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v)$ (with $\mathcal{B}^v = 2\mathcal{B}$).

□

Now we can prove the stakes lemma and conclude the article.

Lemma 8.8 (Macro 3: stakes lemma)**.** *Let P be a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying macroscopic initial conditions. If P does not satisfy the stakes constraint then it is fragile or pumpable.*

Proof. This proof is done in three steps. During the first step, we initialize different tools (seed constraint, fork) to set up a good setting. During the second step, we build the first stake and during the third one we build the second stake. Several incidents may occurs during the construction of the stakes but anyone of these problems leads to the fragility or pumpability of P.

Initialization: see Figures 138 and 139 for an illustration of this part of the proof. By the seed lemma (lemma 4.7), we have $\text{dom}(\sigma) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma)$ or P is fragile or pumpable. By lemma 8.7, either P is fragile or pumpable or there exists $1 \leq s^- < s^+ \leq \mathbf{4}$ such that $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ is a visible candidate segment of direction $\overrightarrow{v}$ such that $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$ and $\text{dom}(P_{[1,s^+]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v)$. By the definition of macroscopic initial conditions, there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{4} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathbf{4} = \min\{i : y_{P_i} = f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1)\}$. Note that $s^+ \leq \mathbf{4}$ and remark that by definition of $\mathbf{4}$, the path assembly $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is an exposed path assembly (with a turn back of $Y_{P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}}$). Now either $\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^b(f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1))$ or not. In the second the case, $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ fits in a band and by lemma 6.7, P is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise, $\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^b(f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1))$ and by applying lemma 7.25 to $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$, either P is fragile or pumpable or there exists a fork F

such that $y_{F_{|F|}} + y_{\overrightarrow{v}} \geq f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1$ and $\text{dom}(F) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^b(f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1) + \mathcal{B})$. Since $||\overrightarrow{v}|| \leq \mathcal{B}$, we have $y_{F_{|F|}} \geq f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + 1$.

Finding the first stake: By definition of F, there exists $\mathbf{1}$ such that $\mathbf{1} = \min\{i : y_{F_i} = f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + 1\}$. By definition of a fork, there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{4}$ such that $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{2}}$ or $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{2}} - \overrightarrow{v}$. We suppose that $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{2}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (the other case is symmetric). Remark that $y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}} \geq f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + 1$ and thus $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{2}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + 1)$. Now, two cases occur either $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot (P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by $\mathcal{T}$ or not. In the second case, since by definition of a fork, the path assembly $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$, then $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ creates a collision with either $F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ or $P_{[1,s^-]} \cup \sigma$. If $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ creates a collision with $F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ (see Figures 143 and 144), by definition of a fork the path assembly $P_{[1,s^+]} \cdot (F + \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ and this path assembly creates a collision with $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ and thus P is fragile. If $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ creates a collision with $P_{[1,s^-]} \cup \sigma$ (see Figures 141 and 142), there exists $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) - \overrightarrow{v} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v)$ and thus $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{3}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B})$. Then P does not satisfies the reset constraint for $\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}$ and by the reset lemma 4.9, P is fragile or pumpable. Then, the path assembly $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]} \cdot P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ (see Figure 140). Let $\mathcal{S}^- = P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ be the first stake. Moreover, since $\mathcal{B}^- = f^b(f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1) + \mathcal{B}$, then $\text{dom}(\mathcal{S}^-) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^-)$.

Finding the second stake: see Figure 145 for an illustration of this part of the proof. By definition of index $\mathbf{4}$ and since $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{4}$, there exist two indices $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{5} \leq |P|$ and $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{8} \leq |P|$ such that $\mathbf{5} = \min\{i \geq \mathbf{2} : \text{pos}(P_i) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B}))\}$ and $\mathbf{8} = \min\{i \geq \mathbf{5} : \text{pos}(P_i) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^j(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B}+1)))\}$. Then either $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{8}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{8}]}$ intersect or not. In the second case, since $\text{dom}(P_{[1,\mathbf{5}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B} + 1))$ then by the jail lemma (lemma 4.14), P is fragile or pumpable. In the second case, there exists $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{6} \leq \mathbf{8}$ and $\mathbf{5} \leq \mathbf{7} \leq \mathbf{8}$ such that $\mathbf{6} = \min\{i \geq \mathbf{5} : \text{pos}(P_i) - \overrightarrow{v} \in \text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{8}]})\}$ and $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{7}}) = \text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{6}}) - \overrightarrow{v}$. Moreover, $\text{dom}(P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6}]}) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^j(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B} + 1)) + 1)$. Now, since $\mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6}]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then either P is fragile or $P_{\mathbf{7}} = P_{\mathbf{6}} - \overrightarrow{v}$ and then $P_{\mathbf{7}} + \overrightarrow{v} = P_{\mathbf{6}}$. Then either $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]} \cdot (P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v})$ is a path assembly producible by P or not. In the first case $\mathcal{S}^+ = P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ is our second stake and the lemma is true since $\text{dom}(\mathcal{S}^+) \subset \mathcal{R}(f^j(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B} + 1)) + \mathcal{B} + 1)$ and $\mathcal{B}^s = f^j(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B} + 1)) + \mathcal{B} + 1$ (see Figure 146). Otherwise, $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ collides with $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]} \cup \sigma$. If the collision occurs between $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ and $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]} \cup \sigma$ then there exists $\mathbf{7} \leq \mathbf{9} \leq |P|$ such that $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{9}} + \overrightarrow{v}) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^-)$ and then $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{9}}) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B})$ (see Figures 147 and 148). Since $\mathbf{9} \geq \mathbf{7} \geq \mathbf{5}$ and since $\text{pos}(P_{\mathbf{5}}) \notin \mathcal{R}(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B}))$ then P does not satisfies the reset constraint for $\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B}$ and by the reset lemma 4.9, P is fragile or pumpable. Otherwise there exists a collision between $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]} + \overrightarrow{v}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6}]}$ and then there exists a collision between $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6}]} - \overrightarrow{v}$ (see Figures 149 and 150). Since $\mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6}]} - \overrightarrow{v})$ is producible by $\mathcal{T}$ then P is fragile.

□

References

[1] Mireille Bousquet-Mélou. Families of prudent self-avoiding walks. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 117(3):313–344, 2010.

[2] Sarah Cannon, Erik D. Demaine, Martin L. Demaine, Sarah Eisenstat, Matthew J. Patitz, Robert Schweller, Scott M. Summers, and Andrew Winslow. Two hands are better than one (up to constant factors). In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, 2013. to appear.

[3] Harish Chandran, Nikhil Gopalkrishnan, and John Reif. Tile complexity of approximate squares. *Algorithmica*, 66(1):1–17, 2013.

[4] Matthew Cook, Yunhui Fu, and Robert T. Schweller. Temperature 1 self-assembly: deterministic assembly in 3D and probabilistic assembly in 2D. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 570–589, 2011. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:0912.0027`.

[5] Erik D. Demaine, Martin L. Demaine, Sándor P. Fekete, Matthew J. Patitz, Robert T. Schweller, Andrew Winslow, and Damien Woods. One tile to rule them all: Simulating any tile assembly system with a single universal tile. In Javier Esparza, Pierre Fraigniaud, Thore Husfeldt, and Elias Koutsoupias, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 41st International Colloquium, ICALP 2014, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 8-11, 2014, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 8572 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 368–379. Springer, 2014. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:1212.4756`.

[6] David Doty, Jack H. Lutz, Matthew J. Patitz, Robert T. Schweller, Scott M. Summers, and Damien Woods. The tile assembly model is intrinsically universal. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 439–446, October 2012. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:1111.3097`.

[7] David Doty, Matthew J. Patitz, and Scott M. Summers. Limitations of self-assembly at temperature 1. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(1–2):145–158, 2011. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:0906.3251`.

[8] Sándor P. Fekete, Jacob Hendricks, Matthew J. Patitz, Trent A. Rogers, and Robert T. Schweller. Universal computation with arbitrary polyomino tiles in non-cooperative self-assembly. In *SODA: ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, San Diego, CA, USA*, 2015.

[9] Paul J. Flory. *Principles of Polymer Chemistry*. 1953.

[10] Bin Fu, Matthew J. Patitz, Robert T. Schweller, and Robert Sheline. Self-assembly with geometric tiles. In *ICALP: Proceedings of the 39th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, LNCS, pages 714–725. Springer, 2012.

[11] Jacob Hendricks, Matthew J. Patitz, Trent A. Rogers, and Scott M. Summers. The power of duples (in self-assembly): It's not so hip to be square. In *COCOON: Proceedings of 20th International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 215–226, 2014. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:1402.4515`.

[12] Natasa Jonoska and Daria Karpenko. Active tile self-assembly, part 1: Universality at temperature 1. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 25(2):141–164, 2014.

[13] D. E. Knuth. Mathematics and computer science: coping with finiteness. *Mathematics: people, problems, results*, 2, 1984.

[14] James I. Lathrop, Jack H. Lutz, Matthew J. Patitz, and Scott M. Summers. Computability and complexity in self-assembly. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 48(3):617–647, 2011.

[15] Ján Maňuch, Ladislav Stacho, and Christine Stoll. Two lower bounds for self-assemblies at temperature 1. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 17(6):841–852, 2010.

[16] Pierre-Étienne Meunier, Matthew J. Patitz, Scott M. Summers, Guillaume Theyssier, Andrew Winslow, and Damien Woods. Intrinsic universality in tile self-assembly requires cooperation. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 752–771, 2014. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:1304.1679`.

[17] Matthew J. Patitz, Robert T. Schweller, and Scott M. Summers. Exact shapes and Turing universality at temperature 1 with a single negative glue. In *DNA 17: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on DNA Computing and Molecular Programming*, LNCS, pages 175–189. Springer, September 2011. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:1105.1215`.

[18] Paul W. K. Rothemund. *Theory and Experiments in Algorithmic Self-Assembly*. PhD thesis, University of Southern California, December 2001.

[19] Paul W. K. Rothemund. Folding DNA to create nanoscale shapes and patterns. *Nature*, 440(7082):297–302, March 2006.

[20] Paul W. K. Rothemund and Erik Winfree. The program-size complexity of self-assembled squares (extended abstract). In *STOC '00: Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 459–468, Portland, Oregon, United States, 2000. ACM.

[21] Nadrian C. Seeman. Nucleic-acid junctions and lattices. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 99:237–247, 1982.

[22] Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. International Thomson Publishing, 1st edition, 1996.

[23] David Soloveichik and Erik Winfree. Complexity of self-assembled shapes. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(6):1544–1569, 2007. Arxiv preprint: `arXiv:cs/0412096`.

[24] A. M. Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem. 42:230–265, 1936.

[25] Lieven M. K. Vandersypen, Matthias Steffen, Gregory Breyta, Costantino S. Yannoni, Mark H. Sherwood, and Isaac L. Chuang. Experimental realization of Shor's quantum factoring algorithm using nuclear magnetic resonance. *Nature*, 414(6866):883–887, December 2001.

[26] John von Neumann and Arthur W. (Arthur Walter) Burks, editors. *Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata*. 1966.

[27] Erik Winfree. *Algorithmic Self-Assembly of DNA*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, June 1998.

[28] Erik Winfree, Furong Liu, Lisa A. Wenzler, and Nadrian C. Seeman. Design and self-assembly of two-dimensional DNA crystals. *Nature*, 394(6693):539–44, 1998.

[29] Bernard Yurke, Andrew J Turberfield, Allen P Mills, Friedrich C Simmel, and Jennifer L Neumann. A DNA-fuelled molecular machine made of DNA. *Nature*, 406(6796):605–608, 2000.

A Functions and bounds

In this appendix, we define precisely all the functions and bounds used along the article. Consider a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. All the following definitions will depend on $|T|$ and $|\sigma|$. We start by

$$f^b(x) = 4x(2x!)(2|T| + 1)^{2x} + 2x|\sigma|.$$

Let f^s be the function defined as

$$f^s(\ell) = |\sigma| + 2(\ell + 3)|T|.$$

Now, consider $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, then we define $\ell_0 = f^s(\ell + 1)$ and for $0 \leq i \leq 4\ell - 1$, let $\ell_{i+1} = f^s(\ell_i + 1)$. The function f^r is the function

$$f^r(\ell) = \ell_{4\ell}.$$

Now, here are the different values of the bounds and the function f^j:

$$\mathcal{B} = f^r(f^b(8|T| + |\sigma|)).$$

$$\mathcal{B}^\sigma = 8|T| + |\sigma| + \mathcal{B}.$$

$$\mathcal{B}^v = 2\mathcal{B}.$$

$$\mathcal{B}^- = f^b(f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1) + \mathcal{B}.$$

$$f^j(x) = 4(\mathcal{B}^2(2\mathcal{B} + 1))(2(2\mathcal{B}^2 + \mathcal{B}))!)(2|T| + 1)^{2\mathcal{B}^2+\mathcal{B}} + \mathcal{B}x^2 + x.$$

$$\mathcal{B}^s = f^j(f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B} + 1)) + \mathcal{B} + 1.$$

$$\mathcal{B}^e = f^r(\mathcal{B}^s(\mathcal{B} + 1)) + 1.$$

$$\mathcal{B}^f = f^j(\mathcal{B}^e + 1) + 1.$$

Note that, $\mathcal{B} < \mathcal{B}^\sigma < \mathcal{B}^v < \mathcal{B}^- < \mathcal{B}^s < \mathcal{B}^e < \mathcal{B}^f$.

B Figures of section 2: definitions and basic properties



(a) A graph G^1 such that $x_{G^1} = 1$, $X_{G^1} = 5$, $y_{G^1} = 1$ and $Y_{G^1} = 3$.



(b) A graph G^2.



(c) The union of graph G^1 and G^2.

Figure 2: Examples of graphs and notations. The vertices of a graph are hatched and the edges are drawn in black. The dotted vertex is $(0, 0)$.



(a) An infinite path P (in grey) and its indexing: the vertex of degree 1 has the index 1.



(b) A bi-infinite path P and one of its indexing: a vertex has to receive the index 0 and an orientation has to be chosen.

Figure 3: Example of finite or bi-infinite paths.



(a) A simple path P (in grey).

(b) A simple path P' (in grey) such that $P'_{|P'|} = P_{|P|}$.

(c) The concatenation $P \cdot P'$. The indexing of this path has the orientation of P.

Figure 4: The concatenation of two paths is not necessarily simple.



Figure 5: We consider a good path P (in grey) and its different extensions: $P^{*+\omega}$ is in hatched; $P^{*-\omega}$ is in hatched (other side); $P^{+\omega}$ is the grey and hatched parts; $P^{-\omega}$ is the grey and hatched (other side) parts; P^{ω} is the three parts together.



(a) A tile of type 2 and its glues. Glues B and C have a strength of 1. Note the absence of glues for the north and east sides, the tile cannot interact with other tile on them. Formally, the glues on these sides have a strength of 0.



The east glue of tile 1 interacts with the west glue of tile 2.

The east glue of tile 8 does not interact with the west glue of tile 2.



(b) Examples of interactions.

Figure 6: Examples of tile types and interactions.



Figure 7: A tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. There is seventeen tile types and the seed is made of the tile S positioned at $(0, 0)$.



(a) The terminal assembly α.



(b) The domain of the assembly α represented in gray (we do not represented the edge).

Figure 8: A terminal assembly producible by the tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ of Figure 7. The seed is in black and the edges between the tiles are only drawn if the tiles interact (if the edges belong to the binding graph).



(a) The assembly β_1 producible by $\mathcal{T}$.



(b) The assembly β_2 producible by $\mathcal{T}$.

Figure 9: The union of these two assemblies is the assembly α of Figure 8a, note that all the intersections between β_1 and β_2 are agreement. The tile S is at position $(0, 0)$ for both assemblies.



(a) The path assembly P, its indexing $(P_i)_{1\leq i\leq 25}$ and its underlying graph.



(b) The assembly induced by P. Remark that the edge between the tiles 6 and 4 does not appear in the underlying path of P.

Figure 10: A path assembly P starting in $P_1 = ((0,0), S)$ and ending in $P_{25} = ((7,-1), 14)$ producible by the tiling system of Figure 7.



(a) The path assembly Q is producible by the tiling system $\mathcal{T}$ of Figure 7 and intersects with the path assembly P of Figure 10. Morevoer this intersection is an agreement.



(b) The path assembly Q' is producible by the tiling system $\mathcal{T}$ of Figure 7 and conflicts with the path assembly P of Figure 10. This result leads to the fragility of P and Q' and to the fact that the tiling system $\mathcal{T}$ is not deterministic.

Figure 11: Intersection, conflict and agreement.



(a) The candidate segment $P_{[3,14]}$ of path assembly P is pumpable. The candidate segment is in light grey while its extension is in dark grey.



(b) The segment $P_{[12,13]}$ is also a candidate segment. Moreover, it can be pumped using reverse pumping. The candidate segment is in light grey while its extension is in dark grey.

Figure 12: Different segments of the path assembly P of Figure 10 are pumpable.



Figure 13: A path assembly R producible by the tiling system of Figure 7 such that its candidate segment $R_{[9,25]}$ is not pumpable. The candidate segment is in light grey and its extension is in dark grey. The first conflict occurs at index 3. The candidate segment is not a good segment and the first conflict occurs at $\text{pos}(P_{23})$.

C Figures of section 4: macroscopic reasoning



Figure 14: The conventions adopted along this article. We consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is in black. First, the path assembly and the seed are in the first quadrant of the plane. Moreover, a border of length of $\mathcal{B}$ is left empty for future constructions. Secondly, the seed is the southwest part of the area occupied by the path assembly and the seed.



(a) The initial path assembly P. The tiles P_1 and P_4 are at distance $\mathcal{B}^f$ of the seed whereas the tiles P_2 and P_3 belongs to the seed.



(b) The path assembly P'.

Figure 15: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 4.5 (part1): we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is in black and the tiles of P which intersect with the seed are marked with a white dot. The rectangle represents the positions which are at distance less than $\mathcal{B}^f$ of the seed. We extract a subassembly from this path assembly which satisfies macroscopic initial conditions.



(a) The path assembly P'' obtained after removing the loops in P'.



(b) The path assembly P''' which satisfies the microscopic initial conditions and which is a subassembly of P (up to symmetry and/or translation).

Figure 16: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 4.5 (part2): we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is in black and the tiles of P which intersect with the seed are marked with a white dot. The rectangle represents the positions which are at distance less than $\mathcal{B}^f$ of the seed. We extract a subassembly from this path assembly which satisfies macroscopic initial conditions.



(a) The segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ does not enter the square $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma + d)$: the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ stays at distance d of the reset constraint is not satisfied for $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma + d)$. Then, the seed. The reset constraint is satisfied for $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^\sigma + d)$. the path assembly Q is fragile or pumpable.

Figure 17: Illustration of the seed constraint and the reset constraint: we consider two paths assemblies P and Q producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and an integer d. Both of these path assemblies satisfy the seed constraint.



(a) The path assembly P, the index s, the vector is $(4,1)$. The segment $P_{[s,|P|]}$ is in dark grey.

(b) The two stakes $\mathcal{S}^-$ and $\mathcal{S}^+$. The translation of the segment $P_{[s,|P|]}$ by $-(4,1)$ (resp. $(4,1)$) is in light gray (resp. dark grey).

Figure 18: Illustration of the third macroscopic lemma: we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is in black.



(a) The segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$.



(b) We have $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}+16$ in our exemple.



(c) The first time that $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ intersects with the translation of P by $-(6,5)$ is in $P_{\mathbf{1}+3}$.



(d) The first time that the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ by $-(6,5)$ intersects with P is in $P_{\mathbf{1}+5}$ translated by $-(6,5)$.

Figure 19: Illustration of Definition 4.15: we consider the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ of a path assembly P and its translation by $-(6,5)$ (in grey).



(a) The path assembly $P_{[1,2]}$ is in white, the good candidate segment $P_{[2,3]}$ is in dark grey and its extension is in light grey. The intersections between $P_{[1,2]}$ and the extension of $P_{[2,3]}$ are marked by a dot.

(b) The path assembly $\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,2]} + (-2,2))$ is in white, the good candidate segment $(P_{[2,3]} + (-2,2))$ is in dark grey and its extension is in light grey. This path assembly is in conflict with P.

Figure 20: Illustration of Lemma 4.23 (*Conflict after stake* final case): We consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $(-2,2)$ at index s according to stakes $\mathcal{S}^+$ and $\mathcal{S}^-$. The seed is in black. If a conflict occurs then using the stake $\mathcal{S}^+$, we can prove the fragility of P.



(a) The path assembly $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is in white, the good candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ of direction $-(-2,2)$ is in dark grey and its extension is in light grey. The intersections between $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ and the extension of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ are marked by a dot.

(b) The path assembly $\mathcal{S}^- \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{2}]} - (-2,2))$ is in white, the good candidate segment $(P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]} - (-2,2))$ is in dark grey and its extension is in light grey. This path assembly is in conflict with P.

Figure 21: Illustration of Lemma 4.25 (*Conflict after stake (reverse)* final case): We consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $(-2,2)$ at index s according to stakes $\mathcal{S}^+$ and $\mathcal{S}^-$. The seed is in black. If a conflict occurs then using the stake $\mathcal{S}^-$, we can prove the fragility of P.



Figure 22: Illustration of Lemma 4.27 (*Pumping enters stakes zone* final case): We consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $(-2, 1)$ at index s. The seed is in black. The good candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is in dark grey and its extension is in light grey. If a conflict occurs near the seed, then the path assembly P does not satisfy the reset constraint.



(a) The path assembly $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ is in white and its reverse extension is in light grey. The conflict between $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ and the reverse extension of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ is marked by a dot.

(b) The path assembly $\mathcal{S}^+ \cdot (P_{[s,\mathbf{3}]} + (0,6))$ is in white. This path assembly is in conflict with P.

Figure 23: Illustration of Lemma 4.29 (*Pumping enters stakes zone (reverse)* final case): We consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ satisfying the macroscopic initial conditions and the stakes constraint of direction $(0,6)$ at index s according to stakes $\mathcal{S}^+$ and $\mathcal{S}^-$. The seed is in black. The good candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$ of direction $-(0,6)$ is in dark grey and its extension collides with the seed. Then by using reverse pumping we obtain one of the previous case. We illustrate the case where $\mathbf{4} < \mathbf{3} - \mathbf{2}$.



Figure 24: Illustration of the different cases of Lemma 4.30.

D Figures of section 5: two dimensional discrete toolbox



(a) A simple bi-infinite path W. (b) The first zone G_1 delimited by W. (c) The second zone G_2 delimited by W.

Figure 25: Cutting the $2D$ grid into two parts with a simple bi-infinite path. Remark that the positions u and v belongs to $V(W)$, $V(G_1)$ and $V(G_2)$ but that the edge (u, v) belongs only to $E(G_2)$. Also, u and w are both corners of W.



(a) An indexing of W; with this convention G_1 is the left side of W and G_2 is the right side of W.

(b) An other indexing of W with a different origin and orientation; with this convention G_1 is the right side of W and G_2 is the left side of W.

Figure 26: Different indexing of the same window.



Figure 27: The different types of vertices and edges of a cut with a window. The vertices a, d, u and v belong to W, G_1 and G_2. The vertices b, e and f belong exclusively to G_1 and c, g and h belong exclusively to G_2. The edges (a, b) and (e, f) are of type I and belong exclusively to G_1. The edges (a, c) and (g, h) are of type II and belong exclusively to G_2. The edge (a, d) is of type III and belongs to W, G_1, and G_2. The edge (u, v) is of type V: it belongs exclusively to G_2 but both of its extremities are in W. According to the indexing of Figure 26b, the edge (u, v) is strictly on the left side of $W_{[2,4]}$.



(a) A simple cycle W.

(b) The finite zone G^I delimited by W.

(c) The infinite zone G^E delimited by W.

Figure 28: Cutting the $2D$ grid using a simple cycle as a window.



(a) Computing the height of the vertices, the window is made of the vertices of height between 0 and 7.

(b) The window is made of a periodic pattern which contains 9 vertices of 8 edges. This indexing is coherent with the vector $(5, 3)$. The represented graph U contains all the vertices of height greater than 0. This graph is the left side of the cut.

Figure 29: Cutting the $2D$ grid with a discrete line, in this example the line is of direction $(5, 3)$ and height 0.



(a) A good path: by extending it, we generate a simple bi-infinite path.

(b) The window W (in grey) generated by the good path and its coherent indexing. We also represent the graph D.

Figure 30: The cut of the grid (U, D) by a good path P of direction $(6, 4)$ and size 23.



(a) A path P with P_1 visible from the west and $P_{|P|}$ visible from the east.

(b) The window W (in grey) generated by this path and a coherent indexing. The cut of the grid is (G_1, G_2) and we represent G_1 which is the left side of W.

Figure 31: Cutting the $2D$ grid with a simple path with visible extremities.



(a) Exemple 1: a cut (A^+, A^-) (resp. (B^+, B^-)) of the grid by a line of direction $(3, 1)$ (resp. $(-1, 3)$).

(b) Exemple 2: the cut of the grid (B^+, B^-) and a cut (C^+, C^-) of graph $B^- \cap C^-$.

(c) Exemple 2: in this case the graph $B^- \cap C^-$ is not connected.

Figure 32: In the first example, the graph $A^- \cap B^-$ (filled in grey) is connected whereas in the second example, the graph $B^- \cap C^-$ is not connected.



(a) A cut (A, B) of the grid and a good path C which splits A.

(b) The graph A^-.

(c) The graph A^+.

Figure 33: The correct way to split a cut of the grid.



Figure 34: Some examples of arcs with the cut of the grid and the window of Figure 31. The paths A^1, A^2, A^4 are all arcs of G_1 whereas A^3 is an arc of G_2. Remark that $A_5 = W_{[88,93]}$ and thus is an arc of both G_1 and G_2. Paths P^1 and P^2 are not arcs. Note that, $V(P^2) \subset V(G_1)$ but $E(P_2)$ is not a subset of $E(G_1)$. Arcs A^1 and A^4 are elementary. Arcs A^3 and A^5 are extremum but not basic. Arc A^2 is basic but not extremum. Path P^1 is basic but not extremum. Path P^2 is neither basic nor extremum. Finally arc A^1 starts in W_{-5} and ends in W_{45}. Arc A^4 is of size two but starts in W_{55} and ends in W_{75}. Path P_2 starts in W_{20} (and not in W_{26}) and ends in W_{111}.



Figure 35: Extracting extremum paths from arc A^2 and paths P^1 and P^2 of Figure 34. The original path is in white.



Figure 36: The window of the restrained interior of path P^1 of figure 34 is represented in grey, it is defined has $W_{[26,29]} \cdot P^1$. Note that the restrained interior is neither a subgraph of G_1 or G_2. The original window is in white.



(a) The extremum arc A^7 and the cut of the grid (G_3, G_4) associated to it. The window W' of this cut of the grid is $W_{[-\infty,29]} \cdot A^7 \cdot W_{[107,+\infty]}$ (in grey) and the graph G^4 is the right side of W'. Also G_4 is a subgraph of G_2 and G_1 is a subgraph of G_3.

(b) The interior of arc A^7, note that this graph is a subgraph of G_2 and its window cannot be defined.

Figure 37: We consider the cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) of Figure 31 (its window W is in white) and an extremum arc A^7 of G_2 which starts in W_{29} and ends in W_{107}. We define here the cut of the grid associated to A^7 and the interior of this arc. Note that A^7 is not basic.



Figure 38: We consider the interior of arc A^1 of Figure 34 and an arc A^6 of G_1 which starts in W_8 and ends in W_{80}. Since A^1 is elementary then the window of its interior can be defined as $W_{[-5,45]} \cdot A^1$ (in grey). The arc A^7 has to intersect with A^1 since $-5 < 8 < 45 < 80$.



Figure 39: Consider the cut of the grid (U, D) by the extension of the simple good path P of Figure 30 and its window W (in grey). We consider an arc A of U which starts in W_1 and ends in W_{42}. Thus the width of this arc is 41 which is greater than the size of P (which is 23). Then A and its translation intersects.



Figure 40: We consider the cut of the grid of Figure 31. The path P is of size 196, starts in W_{-6} and ends in W_{104}. We have $P_1 = W_1$, $P_{16} = W_{-6}$, $P_{108} = W_{104}$ and $P_{|P|} = W_{96}$ and thus P is positive.



(a) The first set of arcs in G_1 obtained from the path P (in white). This set contains eleven arcs.

(b) The second set of arcs obtained from the path P of figure 40 in G_1: the arcs of figure 41a are replaced by their extremum arcs.

Figure 41: We consider the path P of figure 40.



Figure 42: The decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 9}$ of P (from Figure 40) in extremum arcs in G_1: the dominated arcs of Figure 41b are removed. The arcs A^1, A^7, A^8, A^9 are negative and the arcs A^2, A^3, A^4, A^5 and A^6 are positive. For the definition of a positive or negative arc of size one, see definition 5.5 or Figure 44.



Figure 43: The decomposition $(S^i)_{1\leq i\leq 9}$ of the window associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$ of Figure 42 and the dual decomposition of the window $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq 9}$. Remark that S^3 and S^9 are reduced to a single vertex whereas the length of a dual segment is at least 2. Also, note that D^{i+1} starts where S^i ends ($D^{i+1}_1 = S^i_{|S^i|}$) and ends where S^{i+1} starts ($D^{i+1}_{|D^{i+1}|} = S^{i+1}_1$) .



(a) Definition of a negative arc of size one, we consider two indices $1 < \mathbf{1} < |P|$ and $\mathbf{2}$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$.

(b) Consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 9}$ of Figure 42. Then arc A^3 is positive and arc A^9 is negative. Moreover, D^1, D^2, D^3,D^4, D^5 and D^6 are positive and D^7 and D^8 are negative.

Figure 44: Orientation of arcs of length 1 and of dual segments.



(a) The interiors of the different arcs of decomposition of Figure 42. All these graphs are subgraph of G_1

(b) The window W' and the cut of the grid (G_3, G_4) associated to the decomposition of Figure 42. Remark that G_3 is a subgraph of G_1 and that G_4 is a subgraph of G_2. Also P is a subgraph of G_4.

Figure 45: We consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 9}$ of Figure 42 and illustrate the different interiors of the arcs and the window associated to the the decomposition. The window W is in white.



(a) Interiors of D^1, D^2, D^7 and D^8.

(b) Interiors of D^3, D^4, D^5 and D^6.

Figure 46: The interiors of the dual segments $(D^i)_{1\leq i\leq 8}$ of the decomposition of Figure 42 (we represent their window in grey and the beginning and the end of a dual segment is indicated by a dot). Since some of these interiors intersect, we represent them in two different figures. The window represented here is the window W' associated to $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 9}$ of Figure 45b. Remark that all of these interiors are subgraph of G_4.



(a) The extremum path Q (hatched path) extracted from path P (in white) of Figure 40. The window in Q). Its window is $W'' = W_{[-\infty,-6]} \cdot Q \cdot W_{[96,+\infty]}$. The grey is W from the cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) of Figure graph G_6 is also the interior of D^0 and D^9.
31.

(b) The cut of the grid (G_5, G_6) associated to P (or

Figure 47: The cut of the grid (G_5, G_6) associated to path P of Figure 40 and the interior of D^0 and D^9.



(a) The decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq 5}$ of Q (in white) in extremum arcs in G_1. The window W is in grey and the arcs are hatched. If we compare this decomposition to the one of P (see figure 42), we have $B^2 = A^2$, $A^3 = B^3$, $B^4 = A^4$ and $B^5 = A^9$. The arc B^1 is dominated by A^1.

(b) The dual decomposition $(E^i)_{0\leq i\leq 5}$ (hatched paths) of W (in white) according to the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq 5}$.

Figure 48: The decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq 5}$ of path Q of Figure 47 into extremum arcs in G_1 (of the cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) of Figure 31) and the dual decomposition $(E^i)_{0\leq i\leq 5}$ of W. Remark that all the arcs and all the dual segments are positive.



(a) The path Q (in white) of figure 47.



(b) The cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) and its window W (in grey) of figure 31.



(c) The cut of the grid (G_3, G_4) associated to the decomposition of Q in extremum arcs (see Figure 48a) and its window W' (in grey). Note that G_3 is a subgraph of G_1. The original window W is in white.



(d) The cut of the grid (G_5, G_6) associated to the extremum path Q and its window W'' (in grey). Note that G_3 is is a subgraph of G_5 and that for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell$, the dual segment E^i (see Figure 48b) is a subgraph of G_5. The window W' is in white.

Figure 49: The different cuts of the grid associated to the extremum path Q of Figure 47.



(a) Case $i = 0$: we consider the path P of Figure 40 and the cut (G_5, G_6) associated to P (see Figure 47). Its window W'' is in grey. Then consider the dual decompositions of the window $(E^i)_{0 \leq i \leq 5}$ (see Figure 48) and $(D^i)_{0 \leq i \leq 9}$ (see Figure 46). Remark that the segment D^6 (in grey) is a subpath of E^4 (in white) and then the interior of D^6 is a subgraph of G_5.

(b) Case $j > 1$: we consider the path P of Figure 40 and the cut (G_3, G_4) associated to the decomposition of P in extremum arcs (see Figure 47). Its window is in grey. Then consider the dual decomposition of the window $(D^i)_{0 \leq i \leq 9}$ (see Figure 46). If the interior of D^4 is a subgraph of the interior of D^8 then let R (in white) such that $D^4 \cdot R$ is the window of the interior of D^4. The path R cannot be simple.

Figure 50: Proof of lemma 5.10: the intersection between two dual segments is a subset of $V(P)$.



Figure 51: Proof of lemma 5.11: we consider the path P (in white) of Figure 40 and the window W (in grey) of Figure 31. The path Q (hatched path) starts in the interior of D^5 and ends in the interior of D^8. We focus on the arc A^8. We define $\mathbf{1}$ (resp. $\mathbf{4}$) as the first (resp. last) time that $Q_{\mathbf{1}}$ (resp. $Q_{\mathbf{4}}$) is in $V(D^5)$ (resp. $V(D^8)$). We define $\mathbf{3}$ as the first time that $Q_{\mathbf{3}}$ is in $V(D^i)$ with $i \geq 8$; here $Q_{\mathbf{3}} \in V(D^9)$. We define $\mathbf{2}$ such that $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ is the last time that $Q_{\mathbf{2}}$ is in $V(D^i)$ with $i < 8$; here $Q_{\mathbf{2}} \in V(D^0)$ then the arc A^8 is dominated by $Q_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{3}]}$.



Figure 52: Proof of lemma 5.12: we consider the path P (in white) of Figure 40 and the window W (in grey) of Figure 31. The interior of D^6 is hatched. Since $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ is a subpath of the interior of D^6 then the decomposition in extremum arcs of P in G_1 is identical to the one of $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$.



(a) The path $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$.

(b) The decomposition of $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ in extremum arcs in G_2.

Figure 53: We consider the path P (in white) of Figure 40 and the window W (in grey) of Figure 31. We consider the index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} < |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^6_{|A^6|}$ and we aim to localize the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$.



(a) The window (in grey) and the cut associated to the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq 7}$ of Figure 53b. The path P is in white and remark that the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ belongs to G_4 (lemma 5.15).

(b) In fact, we can be more precise (corollary 5.17): since A^6 is positive then the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is in the interior of D^6 where $(D^i)_{0\leq i\leq 7}$ is the dual decomposition of W according to the decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq 7}$.

Figure 54: Localization of the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ of Figure 53 according to lemma 5.15 and corollary 5.17.

Detailed example:



The nine cases are the combination of

one of these neighborhoods of $W_{\mathbf{2}}$: with one of these neighborhoods of $P_{\mathbf{1}}$:



Figure 55: First part of the local reasoning of proof 5.16. We have $P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$. In this case, W' is the window of the interior of the dual segment and $W'_{\mathbf{3}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$, $W'_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $W'_{\mathbf{3}+1} = W_{\mathbf{2}+1}$. We conclude that the edge $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ is on the right side of $W'_{[\mathbf{3}-1,\mathbf{3}+1]}$, *i.e.* in the interior of the dual segment.

Detailed examples:



The eight cases are the combination of

one of these neighborhoods of $W_{\mathbf{2}}$: with one of these neighborhoods of $P_{\mathbf{1}}$:



Figure 56: Second part of the local reasoning of proof 5.16. We have $P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$. In this case, W'' is the window associated to the decomposition of in extremum arcs in G_1 and $W''_{\mathbf{3}} = P_{\mathbf{1}} = W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $W''_{\mathbf{3}+1} = W_{\mathbf{2}+1}$. We have $W''_{\mathbf{3}-1} = P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ if the edge $(P_{\mathbf{2}}, P_{\mathbf{2}+1})$ is on the left side of $W_{[\mathbf{2}-1,\mathbf{2}+1]}$ and $W''_{\mathbf{3}-1} = W_{\mathbf{2}-1}$ otherwise. In every cases, we conclude that the edge $(P_{\mathbf{1}}, P_{\mathbf{1}+1})$ is on the left side of $W''_{[\mathbf{3}-1,\mathbf{3}+1]}$, *i.e.* in G_5. The combination of the two dotted neighborhood leads to a case where A^i is a negative arc of length 1.



(a) Setting of the proof: the window is in grey. The path P is positive and then $\mathbf{3} < \mathbf{4}$. For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$.



(b) Case $\mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{2}$: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{1}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^j.



(c) Case $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{3}$: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{1}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{1}+1,\mathbf{6}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^j or A^i.



(d) Case $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{1}$ and B^1 is positive: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{4}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^j.



(e) Case $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{1}$ and B^1 is negative: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{1}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^j.

Figure 57: Illustration of proof 5.18.



(a) Setting of the proof: the window is in grey, we have $P_{\mathbf{1}} = A^{i+1}_{|A^{i+1}|}$, the arc A^{i+1} is negative, $P_{\mathbf{2}} = A^{i}_{|A^{i}|}$ and since D^i is negative then $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$.

(b) the path $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of the interior of D^i and contains no relevant information.

Figure 58: Illustration of lemma 5.19 and corollary 5.20.



(a) Illustration of corollary 5.21: A^i is negative, D^i is positive and then the path $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ is a subgraph of the interior of D^i and contains no relevant information.

(b) Illustration of corollary 5.22: A^i and A^{i+1} are both negative while D^i is positive and then the paths $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ are both subgraph of the interior of D^i and contains no relevant information.

Figure 59: Illustration of corollary 5.21 and corollary 5.22.



(a) Setting of the proof. The arc A^i and A^k are positive while A^j is negative



(b) Case $\mathbf{4} < \mathbf{1}$: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{2}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^i or A^j.



(c) Case $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{3} \leq \mathbf{4} < \mathbf{5}$: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{4}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{4}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^i or A^j.



(d) Case $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{3}$: we consider $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{6}]}$ and then the path $P_{[\mathbf{6}+1,\mathbf{7}]}$ contains an arc which dominates A^i or A^k.

Figure 60: Illustration of proof 5.23.



Figure 61: Illustration of the first case of lemma 5.24. A path P such that A^1, A^2, A^3 and A^4 are all negative. The dual segment D^2 is the only positive one. With $j = 3$ and $k = 2$, the lemma is true.



Figure 62: Proof of lemma 5.26. For this local reasoning, we have $P_2 = W_3$.



Figure 63: Illustration of lemma 5.28. We consider a cut of the grid (G_1, G_2), its window W (in grey), a path P (in white) and an index $\mathbf{1}$ such that $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ is extremum and $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ is a subgraph of the right side of the cut associated to the path $P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$. Then, we consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 4}$ (hatched arcs) of P in extremum arcs in G_1 and the dual decomposition of the window W. If G_1 is the left side of the cut of the grid then all the first edges of the dual segment belong strictly to the left side of P.



(a) The extremum and positive arc A of G_1 in hatched.

(b) The decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 4}$ of A into four elementary positive arcs of G_1. Remark that $A^1_{|A^1|} = A^2_1$.

Figure 64: Illustration of definition 5.29: we consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid and its window W in grey. The arc A of G_1 is extremum and positive. We consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 4}$ of A into four elementary positive arcs of G_1.



(a) The arc B in hatched.



(b) Case $y > x$: the arc A^4 (in white) is negative. Then this arc collides either with B (in hatched) or with $A_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{8}]}$ (in reversed hatched).



(c) Case $x < y$: the arc A^4 is not consecutive to the arc A^3 and then the arc $A_{[\mathbf{8},|A|]}$ has to intersect with A^3.

Figure 65: Illustration of the proof of lemma 5.30: we consider the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 4}$ of Figure 64b but we suppose that the arc A^4 is either negative or positive.



(a) A path P (in hatched) satisfying the hypothesis of lemma 5.31.



(b) The decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq 5}$ of the path P in extremum arcs in G_1. Remark that A^1, A^2 and A^3 are positive.

Figure 66: Illustration of the proof of lemma 5.31, first part. We consider a cut of the grid (G_1, G_2) and its window W in grey.



(a) The arc A (in hatched) of G_1 and the window W in grey.



(b) The restrained interior G^I of the basic path P (in hatched) and its window C in grey. The window W is in white.



(c) The restrained interior of the basic arc A (in hatched) and its window Q in grey. Both of them are subgraph of G^I. The window W is in white.

Figure 67: Illustration of the proof of lemma 5.31, second part. We consider the cut of the grid (G_1, G_2), its window W and the path P of Figure 66.

D.1 Illustrations for finding a new split



(a) The window W, the arc A and the good path C.

(b) The infinite path $C^{+\omega}$.

Figure 68: The initial setting, we consider a cut (G_1, G_2) of the grid with a window W (in grey) at position $W_{\mathbf{1}}$. The graph G_1 is split by a path C (in white) of direction $(0, 20)$ into (G_1^-, G_1^+). The hatched arc A of G_1^+ is such that $A_1 = C_1$ and $A_{|A|} = C_{|C|}$.



(a) We consider the cut (C^-, C^+) by the bi-infinite window $W' = C^\omega$ (in grey) and the decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2}$ of A in simple arcs in C^+.

(b) Remark that the arc A^2 is a simple arc of G_1^+ but A^1 is an arc of G_1^+ which is not simple.

Figure 69: We decompose the arc A in two arcs A^1 and A^2 (in hatched).



(a) The translation of A^1 by $(0, 20)$ is not an arc of G_1^+ but it satisfies the hypothesis of lemma 5.31.

(b) By applying lemma 5.31 on the translation of A^1 by $(0, 20)$, we obtain the arc B^1 such that this arc and its translation by $(0, 20)$ both fit into G_1^+.

Figure 70: We focus on the arc A^1 and we shrink it into B^1 such that B^1 and the translation of B^1 by $(0, 20)$ both fit in G_1^+. Remark that the translation of B^1 by $(0, 20)$ intersects with W in $W_\mathbf{2}$ with $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$.



(a) The translation of B^1 by $(0, 40)$ is not an arc of G_1^+ but it satisfies the hypothesis of lemma 5.31.

(b) By applying lemma 5.31 on the translation of B^1 by $(0, 40)$, we obtain the arc C^1 such that this arc and its translation by $(0, 40)$ both fit into G_1^+.

Figure 71: We focus on the arc B^1 and we shrink it into C^1 such that C^1 and the translation of C^1 by $(0, 40)$ both fit in G_1^+. Remark that the translation of C^1 by $(0, 40)$ intersects with W in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ with $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$.



(a) The translation of A^2 by $(0, 40)$ is not an arc of G_1^+ but it satisfies the hypothesis of lemma 5.31.

(b) By applying lemma 5.31 on the translation of A^2 by $(0, 40)$, we obtain the arc C^2 such that this arc and its translation by $(0, 40)$ both fit into G_1^+.

Figure 72: We focus on the arc A^2 and we shrink it into C^2 such that C^2 and the translation of C^2 by $(0, 40)$ both fit in G_1^+. Remark that the translation of C^2 by $(0, 40)$ intersects with W in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ with $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$.



(a) The path R of direction $(0, 20)$. (b) The infinite path $R^{+\omega}$ fits in G_1^+.

Figure 73: Now, we construct the path R of direction $(0, 20)$ such that $R^{+\omega}$ fits in G_1^+ and intersects with W in $W_\mathbf{2}$ with $\mathbf{2} > \mathbf{1}$.

E Figures of section 6: modified window lemma and jailed path assembly



Figure 74: The grid G could be partitioned using discrete line. Here the direction of the lines is $(5,3)$. Thus the line L^0 (in hatched) contains all the vertices of height between 0 and 7. The edges e_1, e_2, e_3 and e_4 belong to two consecutive discrete lines while the edges e_5, e_6, e_7 and e_8 belong to only one discrete line.



Figure 75: A path assembly P and its movie $(\mathcal{M}_i)_{1\leq i\leq 4}$ of direction $(5,3)$ and height 0. For any $1 \leq i \leq 4$, the output glue $\mathcal{M}_i$ is (g_i, e_i) where g_i is the type of the glue between the abuttal sides of the two tiles at the extremities of e_i. The discrete line L^0 is in grey and the parts of P which belong to U^1 are in grey.



Figure 76: The discrete line L^0 (in grey) of direction $(5,3)$ is used as a reference to compare the different movies. The indexing of L^0 is chosen such that $L^0_0 = (0,0)$ and for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $L^0_i + (5,3) = L^0_{i+8}$. We consider a movie $\mathcal{M}$ of height -4 (the discrete line L^{-4} is in grey). Then, we found a vector such that the $\mathcal{M}'$, which is the translation of $\mathcal{M}$ by this vector, is a movie of L^0.



(a) The cut of the grid (U, D) and the path P.



(b) The decomposition $(A^i)_{1 \leq i \leq 4}$ (in hacthed) of P in extremum arcs in G_1.



(c) Remark that for all $2 \leq i \leq 4$ the translation of the arc A^i by $-(0, 8)$ is dominated by A^{i-1}.

Figure 77: Conjecture of the worst case of Lemma 6.8: we consider a cut (U, D) of the grid by a discrete line of direction $(8, 0)$ and its window W (in grey). We consider a path P of width 28 such that P does not intersect with its translation by $-(8, 0)$. Any path with a strictly greater width cannot have this property.



(a) The cut of the grid (U, D) by a discrete line of direction $(14, 0)$, its window W in grey and the path P in hatched.



(b) The path Q (in light grey) which the translation of P by $-(14, 0)$.



(c) The decomposition $(B^i)_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$ of the path $Q_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ in extremum arcs in U and the decomposition $A^i_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$ of path P in extremum arcs in U. Arc A^1 is dominated by B^3 and arc A^3 is dominated by B^5.



(d) The sequence of arcs $(C^i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2}$ of increasing width.

Figure 78: Proof of the first case of lemma 6.8: how to find a sequence of arcs of increasing width.



(a) The cut of the grid (U, D) by a discrete line of direction $(14, 0)$, its window W in grey and the path P in hatched.



(b) The path Q (in light grey) which the translation of P by $-(14, 0)$.



(c) The decomposition $(B^i)_{1\leq i\leq 3}$ of the path Q in extremum arcs in U and the decomposition $A^i_{1\leq i\leq 3}$ of path P in extremum arcs in U. The arc B^3 starts after $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ and is dominated by A^2.



(d) The sequence of arcs $(C^i)_{1\leq i\leq 2}$ of decreasing width.

Figure 79: Proof of the second case of lemma 6.8: how to find a sequence of arcs of decreasing width.

E.1 Illustrations for the modified window movie lemma



Figure 80: We consider the path assembly P producible by the tilling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$, the tile P_1 is positioned at $(0, 0)$ and the seed is in black. We consider the height function associated to the vector of direction $(1, 0)$ and we represent L^8 and L^{18} in grey. We consider the movie $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}((0, 1), 8)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}((0, 1), 18)$) such that for all $1 \leq i \leq 7$, we have $edge(\mathcal{M}_i) = e_i$ ($edge(\mathcal{M}'_i) = e'_i$). We suppose that the movies $\mathcal{M} + (4, 10)$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are equal. The part of P which belongs to U^9 is represented in grey.



Figure 81: The path assembly P^{*1} obtained after applying the window movie lemma on the path assembly P of Figure 80. The tiles of P^{*1} in white are identical to the ones of P and the tiles of P^{*1} in grey are the ones of P in grey in Figure 80 translated by $(4, 10)$.



Figure 82: We consider the path assembly P^{*1} of Figure 81. Remark that the movies $\mathcal{M}((0,1),8)$ and $\mathcal{M}((0,1),18)$ of this path assembly are identical to the ones of the path assemble P of Figure 80. Thus the window movie lemma can be applied again. The part of P^{*1} which belongs to U^9 is represented in grey.



Figure 83: The path assembly P^{*2} obtained after applying the window movie lemma on the path assembly P^{*1} of Figure 82. The tiles of P^{*2} in white are identical to the ones of P^{*1} and the tiles of P^{*2} in grey are the ones of P^{*1} in grey in Figure 82 translated by $(4, 10)$.



Figure 84: We consider the path assembly P of Figure 80. Remark that the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ (in grey) is of direction $(4, 10)$, is a candidate segment and belongs to U^9.



Figure 85: The segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of Figure 84 appears translated by $(4, 10)$ in the path assembly P^{*1} of Figure 81 (in grey in this Figure).



Figure 86: The segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of Figure 84 appears translated by $(8, 20)$ in the path assembly P^{*2} of Figure 83 (in grey in this Figure).



Figure 87: We can conclude that either the path assembly P of Figure 80 is fragile or the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of Figure 84 is pumpable. Remark that, in this case, this segment is not good.

F Figures of section 7: microscopic reasoning



(a) The tiles of P which are visible from the west and not hidden by the seed are in grey. The tile σ_1 is a tile of the seed visible from the west. The tile P_1 is visible from the west but it is hidden by the seed. Note that the tile P_1 is a tile of P visible from the west and not hidden by the seed which also belongs to the seed.



(b) The tiles of P which are visible from the east are in grey.

Figure 88: We consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is represented in black. We represent some visible tiles.



Figure 89: We consider the path assembly P of Figure 88 and we study the orientation of the tiles visible from the west. Tiles with an arrow oriented to the south (resp. south-east) are oriented to the south and exist to the south (resp. east). Tiles with an arrow oriented to the north (resp. north-east) are oriented to the north and exist to the north (resp. east). The tile P_1 is oriented to the south and exists to the south. Remark that for this path, there exists a value ws such that all tiles lower than this values are oriented to the south and all tiles over this value are oriented to the north.



Figure 90: We consider the path assembly P of Figure 88 and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ are visible from the west. Then it is possible to define the cut of the grid (C^+, C^-) associated to the segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ whose extremities are visible from the west. The graph C^- (in hatched) is the right side of the cut. Tiles in grey are visible from the west and their ordinates is between $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}}$ and $y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}}$ then they must belong to $V(C^+)$. Moreover tiles which belongs to $V(C^+) \setminus V(W)$ cannot be not visible from the east.



Figure 91: We present here a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ which is not exposed: its tail is long and its last tile is not visible from the east (it is hidden by the grey tile). The tile P_t is the first highest tile of P.



Figure 92: Illustration of the proof of lemma 7.5: we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The tile P_t is he first highest tile of P. If a tile of $P_{[1,t]}$ is hidden by a tile of $P_{[t+1,|P|]}$ then $P_{[t+1,|P|]}$ has to enter in C^+ (the window of this area is in grey). Three cases may occur but all lead to a contradiction. We only represent the underlying path of $P_{[t,|P|]}$ for each of these cases.



(a) Case $\mathbf{1} < \mathbf{2}$: we only represent $P_{[\mathbf{1},|P|]}$ and the tile in grey hides the visibility of $P_{|P|}$ from the east.

(b) Case $\mathbf{2} < \mathbf{1}$: we only represent $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ and the tile in grey hides the visibility of $P_{|P|}$ from the east

Figure 93: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 7.7: we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ are both visible from the west, $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} \leq y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}}$, $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is oriented to the north and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ is oriented to the south. Then, we show that the last tile of P is in C^+ (whose window is in grey) and cannot be visible from the east (thus P is not an exposed path assembly).



Figure 94: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 7.9: we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and two indices $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ and $1 \leq \mathbf{2} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ are both visible from the west, $y_{P_{\mathbf{1}}} \leq y_{P_{\mathbf{2}}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is oriented to the north. If $\mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{1}$ then the last tile of P is in C^+ (whose window is in grey) and cannot be visible from the east (thus P is not an exposed path assembly). We only represent $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$.



Figure 95: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 7.11: we consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and an index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is visible from the west, oriented to the south and not hidden by the seed. Then, we show that $y_P < y_\sigma$. This proof relies on the fact that the tile $P_{\mathbf{1}-1}$ is in C^+ (whose window is in grey).



Figure 96: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 7.12: we consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ and an index $1 \leq \mathbf{1} \leq |P|$ such that $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ is visible from the west, oriented to the south and not hidden by the seed. Then, the first lowest tile is visible from the west, exists to the east and is not hidden by the seed. This figure represents the reasoning by contradiction done in the proof. The area G^I is in hatched and its window is in grey.



Figure 97: Illustration of the proof of lemma 7.13: we consider a path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The tile P_t is he first highest tile of P. The tiles $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{3}}$ are visible from the east. We consider the cut (C^+, C^-) of the grid and its window W (in grey). Three cases may occur along the proof but all lead to a contradiction. We only represent the underlying path of $\sigma \cup P_{[1,t]}$ for each of these cases.



(a) A path assembly P with a candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$.

(b) The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ is a fork.



(c) A path assembly P with a candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$.

(d) The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ is a not fork but the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a fork.

Figure 98: Illustrations of some forks.



(a) An exposed path assembly P with a visible candidate segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$.

(b) The free zone $\mathcal{F}$ associated to $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ and its window W.

Figure 99: Definition of the free zone. Remark that the free zone contains no tile of the seed or of $P_{[1,s^--1]}$. Moreover, it contains all the tiles which are west of P_{s^+}.



Figure 100: The three cases of the local reasoning of proof 7.16. We have $W_0 = P_{s^-}$, $W_1 = P_{s^-+1}$, $W_{-1} = W_0 - (1,0)$ and $W_{-1} \neq P_{s^--1}$. Moreover P_{s^-} is oriented to the north. In every cases, the edge $(\text{pos}(P_{s^-}), \text{pos}(P_{s^--1}))$ is strictly on the right side of $W_{[-1,1]}$.



Figure 101: The visibility of P_{s^+} splits the free zone in two areas: consider an arc A (in white) of $\mathcal{F}$ which starts in $W_{\mathbf{1}}$ and ends in $W_{\mathbf{2}}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{2} \geq n$ then there exists $1 \leq \mathbf{3} \leq |A|$ such that $x_{A_{\mathbf{3}}} \leq x_{P_{s^+}}$ and $y_{A_{\mathbf{3}}} = y_{P_{s^+}}$.



(a) The window W (in grey) of the free zone and the translation of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ (in white).



(b) The decomposition $(A^i)_{1\le i\le 7}$ in extremum arcs of the translation of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ in $\mathcal{F}$. Remark that $A^1_1 = W_0$ and all arcs are positive.



(c) The dual decomposition $(D^i)_{0\le i\le 7}$ of W. Remark that $D^0 = W_{[-\infty,0]}$ and all dual segments are positive.



(d) The decomposition $(B^i)_{1\le i\le 7}$ (hatched arcs) in extremum arcs of the translation of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$ (in white) in $\mathcal{F}$. Remark that B^7 is negative.

Figure 102: Analysis of the translation of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$, we consider the path assembly and the window of Figure 99.



(a) The window W (in grey), the translation of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ (in white) and the decomposition $(A^1)_{1\leq i\leq \ell}$, see Figure 102.



(b) The window W' (in grey) associated to the decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 7}$. Remark that W' is a subgraph of the free zone (the window W is in white).



(c) The trajectory D (in hatched) is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$. The window W is in grey.



(d) The translation of D is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$.

Figure 103: How to find a trajectory from an exposed path assembly P with a visible candidate segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$. We use the path assembly P and the free zone of Figure 99.



(a) Proof of lemma 7.20: the translation of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$ cannot intersect with $W_{[-\infty,0]}$ otherwise the visibility of P_{s^+} would be hidden.

(b) Graphical representation of proof 7.24: no translation of a dual segment D^i could intersect with $W_{[-\infty,-1]}$ otherwise the visibility of P_{s^-} would be hidden.

Figure 104: Proof of lemmas 7.20 and 7.24.



Figure 105: Graphical representation of proof of lemma 7.20: we considered the cut associated to an extremum path extracted from the translation of $W_{[n,+\infty]}$, its window W'' is in grey. The end of the path R (in white) belongs to the right side of this cut.



Figure 106: A path assembly P with a visible candidate segment of direction $(0, 6)$ which does a U-turn.



(a) The decomposition $(A^i)_{1\leq i\leq 7}$ of the translation by $-(0,6)$ of the underlying path of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$ in extremum arcs in $\mathcal{F}$.

(b) The trajectory D (in hacthed) is an extremum arc of the free zone. Remark that the translation of W_m by $-(0,6)$ is too low to belong to the free zone.

(c) The translation of D by $(0,6)$ is too high to reach $W_{[m,+\infty]}$.

Figure 107: Properties of the trajectory of the path assembly P of Figure 106. This path assembly makes a U-turn. We do not represent the path assembly, we draw only the window W of the free zone in grey.



(a) A good path C which splits $\mathcal{F}$ at $\mathrm{pos}(P_d)$. The window W is in grey.

(b) The graph $\mathcal{F}^+$ (in hatched) and its window (in grey). The window W is in white.

(c) The graph $\mathcal{F}^-$ (in hatched) and its window (in grey). The window W is in white.

Figure 108: We split the path assembly P of Figure 106 at $\mathrm{pos}(P_d)$ with a good path C of direction $(0, 6)$. We do not represent the path assembly, we only draw the window W of the free zone.



(a) Illustration of lemma 7.30: remark that $D_{[0,\mathbf{1}]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^-$ and $D_{[\mathbf{1},|D|]}$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}^+$.

(b) Proof of lemma 7.30: if the trajectory (in hatched) intersects with $V(C^{+\omega}) \setminus \{C_0\}$ then one of the two grey dots has to belong to $\mathrm{dom}(P)$ which is a contradiction.

Figure 109: Illustration and proof of lemma 7.30: we consider the path assembly P of Figure 106 and its window W (in grey), the trajectory of Figure 107b (in hacthed) and the good path C (in white) of Figure 108. Remark that splitting the free zone also splits the trajectory.



(a) Remark that the translation of C (of Figure 108) is not a subgraph of the free zone then P_d is not a dominant tile.

(b) Remark that the translation of C is a subgraph of $\mathcal{F}$ but not of $\mathcal{F}^-$ then P_d is not a dominant tile.

(c) The tile P_d positioned at C_0 is dominant.

Figure 110: Illustration of Definition 7.31 of a dominant tile. We consider the path assembly P of Figure 106. We do not represent the path assembly, we only draw the window W of the free zone in grey. In all cases, the good path C splits the free zone at $\text{pos}(P_d) = C_0$.



(a) Case $\text{pos}(P_d) - (0, 6)$ belongs to the interior of an arc A^i.

(b) In fact $\text{pos}(P_d) - (0, 6)$ belongs to $V(A^3)$ and $\text{pos}(P_d)$ to $V(D^4)$, see Figure 107.

Figure 111: Illustration of the proof of lemma 7.32: we consider the path assembly P of Figure 106, its window W in grey and the dominant tile of Figure 110c. We zoom around tile P_d.



(a) The tile P_d positioned at C_0 is dominant.

(b) The candidate segment $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ of F (in grey).

(c) The translation of $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ by $(0, 6)$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}^+$.

Figure 112: Illustration of lemmas 7.33, 7.34 and 7.35: if P_d (from Figure 110c) is dominant and $P_d = F_\mathbf{2}$ then there exists $\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{2}$ such that $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a good candidate segment of F.



(a) Special case when $\mathbf{4} = 1$: either the translation of $(C_{\mathbf{3}}, C_{\mathbf{3}+1})$ by $-(0,6)$ is not an edge of $\mathcal{F}$ or the arc A^k starts in D_1^k and is of length strictly greater than 1. Both cases are a contradiction

(b) Case $\mathbf{4} > 1$: the translation of $(C_{\mathbf{14}}, C_{\mathbf{14}+1})$ by $-(0,6)$ is not an edge of $\mathcal{F}$ which is a contradiction.

Figure 113: Illustration of the proof of lemma 7.34: the translation of the candidate segment $F_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ by $(0,6)$ (of Figure 112b represented in hatched) belongs to $\mathcal{F}^+$. We represent in grey the window W of Figure 107 and in white the infinite path $C^{+\omega}$ of Figure 110c.



(a) The segment of the fork is pumpable but is not a segment of P: $P_{d'}$ is a dominant tile.

(b) The good candidate segment $P_{[\mathbf{8},\mathbf{9}]}$ is pumpable.

Figure 114: Illustration of proof of lemma 7.36: we consider the path assembly P of Figure 106 and the dominant tile of Figure 110. We zoom around tile P_d.



Figure 115: Illustration of the proof of lemma 7.37 and of the path R built to find one dominant tile. We consider the path assembly P of Figure 106. The window of the free zone is in grey and the infinite path $R^{+\omega}$ is hatched. The tile P_d positioned at $R_{\mathbf{4}}$ is dominant.

F.1 Illustrations for building a fork



Figure 116: Input: we consider the exposed path assembly P (in white) with a visible candidate segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ of Figure 99. The window of the free zone is in grey, the trajectory D is hatched. Note that $W_0 = \mathrm{pos}(P_{s^-}) = D_1$, $W_m = \mathrm{pos}(P_{s^+})$ and $W_m = \mathrm{pos}(P_{|P|})$.



Figure 117: Initialization: we start by building a fork F (in grey) such that $\text{pos}(F_1) = \text{pos}(P_1)$, such that $\text{type}(F_1) = \text{type}(P_{s^+}) = \text{type}(P_{s^-})$ and such that its underlying path is A^1 (see Figure 102b).



Figure 118: Phase Dual: either P is fragile or the type of the last tile of the current fork F (in grey) matches the type of a tile of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$. Moreover, this tile is positioned at D_1^1 (see Figure 102c).



Figure 119: Phase Dual: if P is not fragile then the current fork F could be extended by copying a part of P such that its underlying path also includes D^1 (see Figure 102c).



Figure 120: Phase Arc: since F is a fork then its translation can be also assembled.



Figure 121: Phase Arc: either P is fragile or the type of the last tile of the translation of the current fork F (in grey) matches the type of a tile of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$. Moreover, this tile is positioned at the translation of A_1^2 (see Figure 102b).



Figure 122: Phase Arc: if P is not fragile then the translation of the current fork F (in grey) can be extended by copying a part of P such that its underlying path also includes the translation of A^2 (see Figure 102b).



Figure 123: Phase Dual: now that the current fork has been extended, we switch back to F.



Figure 124: Phase Dual: either P is fragile or the type of the last tile of the current fork F (in grey) matches the type of a tile of $P_{[s^-,|P|]}$. Moreover, this tile is positioned at D_1^2 (see Figure 102c).



Figure 125: Phase Dual: if P is not fragile then the current fork F could be extended by copying a part of P such that its underlying path also includes D^2 (see Figure 102c).



Figure 126: Phase Arc: since F is a fork then its translation can be also assembled.



Figure 127: Phase Arc: either P is fragile or the type of the last tile of the translation of the current fork F (in grey) matches the type of a tile of $P_{[s^+,|P|]}$. Moreover, this tile is positioned at the translation of A_1^3 (see Figure 102b).



Figure 128: Phase Arc: if P is not fragile then the translation of the current fork F (in grey) can be extended by copying a part of P such that its underlying path also includes the translation of A^3 (see Figure 102b).



Figure 129: Phase Dual: now that the current fork has been extended, we switch back to F.



Figure 130: By iterating this reasoning we obtain a long fork whose underlying path matches the trajectory.



Figure 131: The translation of the long fork.

G Figures of section 8: from microscopic reasoning to macroscopic one: proof of the remaining macroscopic lemmas



(a) The exposed path assembly P. The tile P_t is the first highest tile of P and the tile P_s is the first lowest tile.

(b) The path assembly Q obtained by a symmetry of $P_{[1,t]}$. This path has a long tail and the segment $Q_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is a visible candidate segment. Also note that the tile Q_s is the first highest tile of Q.

Figure 132: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.2: we consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is represented in black. The segment $P_{[\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}]}$ is visible from the south, not hidden by the west and exits to the east or to the south. Then using a symmetry, we can find a path Q which does a U-turn.



Figure 133: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.4: we consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is represented in black. The more a path assembly grows to the north, the more it is easy to find a candidate segment such that the space between its two extremities is large enough to find a U-turn.



(a) The tile P_5 is visible from the east then Lemma 8.4 could be used to conclude.

(b) The tile P_5 is not visible from the east then $P_{[1,2]}$ (in grey) satisfies the recurrence.

Figure 134: Illustration of the recurrence of the proof of Lemma 8.5: we consider an exposed path assembly P producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is represented in black.



Figure 135: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.7: we consider the translation P' of a path assembly P which satisfies macroscopic initial conditions and which is producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$ by the vector $-(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B})$. The seed is represented in black. First, the seed belongs to $\mathcal{R}(8|T| + |\sigma|)$ (otherwise, we conclude by Lemma 4.7). Secondly, we have $Y_{P_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}} > 8|T|+|\sigma|$ otherwise we conclude by Lemma 6.7. Thirdly, there exists a visible candidate segment of $P_{[1,\mathbf{2}]}$ (otherwise we conclude by Lemma 8.2). Finally, if this candidate segment is not visible in P then we can conclude by Lemma 8.6.



(a) The path assembly P.



(b) The path assembly P after switching the x and y axis.



(c) The path assembly P after switching north and south.



(d) The path assembly P after switching east and west: its tail is long.

Figure 136: Illustration of the first case proof of Lemma 8.2: we consider an exposed path assembly P which grows at distance $4|T|$ both to the west and to the east of the seed (which is represented in black). Using several symmetries, we can find a visible candidate segment such that P does a U-turn.



(a) The path assembly P.



(b) The path assembly P after switching the x and y axis.



(c) The path assembly P after switching north and south.



(d) The path assembly P after switching east and west: its tail is long.

Figure 137: Illustration of the second case proof of Lemma 8.2: we consider an exposed path assembly P which grows at distance $4|T|$ both to the west and to the east of the seed (which is represented in black). Using several symmetries, we can find a candidate segment oriented to the south such that P does a U-turn.

G.1 Illustrations for building the stakes



Figure 138: Illustration of the initialization phase of Lemma 8.8 (part 1): we consider a path assembly P which satisfies macroscopic initial conditions and which is producible by a tiling system $\mathcal{T} = (T, \sigma, 1)$. The seed is represented in black. We only represent $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$. First, we find a candidate segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ (of direction $(3,3)$ in this case) such that $P_{[1,s^+]}$ fits in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v)$ using Lemma 8.7. Secondly, we have $Y_{P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}} > f^r(\mathcal{B}^v + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{B} + 1$ otherwise we conclude by Lemma 6.7. Now remark that $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ is an exposed path assembly and then we can consider the fork associated to the segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ (see the following Figure).



Figure 139: Illustration of the initialization phase of Lemma 8.8 (part 2): we can consider the fork F associated to the segment $P_{[s^-,s^+]}$ of $P_{[1,\mathbf{4}]}$ of Figure 138. This fork is represented in grey and $Y_{F_{|F|}} > f^r(\mathcal{B}^v+\mathcal{B})$ thus we can define $F_{\mathbf{1}}$. In this case, there exists $s^+ \leq \mathbf{2} \leq \mathbf{4}$ such that $F_{\mathbf{1}} = P_{\mathbf{2}} - (3,3)$. Thus we can try to attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ at the end of the current path assembly. Three cases can occur, they are illustrated in the five following Figures.



Figure 140: Illustration for finding the first stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 1): we can attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ at the end of the fork of Figure 138. In this case, we have found the first stake: $P_{[1,s^-]} \cdot F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ and this stake fits in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^-)$. The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ is represented in light grey.



Figure 141: Illustration for finding the first stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 2 part 1): we cannot attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ at the end of the fork of Figure 138. In this case, a collision occurs in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^v)$. The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ is represented in light grey.



Figure 142: Illustration for finding the first stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 2, part 2): the tile $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ is not in $f^r(\mathcal{B}^v+\mathcal{B})$ while the tile $P_{\mathbf{3}}$ is in $\mathcal{B}^v+\mathcal{B}$. Then P does not satisfies the reset constraint.



Figure 143: Illustration for finding the first stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 3 part 1): we cannot attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ at the end of the fork of Figure 138. In this case, a collision occurs with the fork. The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(3,3)$ is represented in light grey.



Figure 144: Illustration for finding the first stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 3 part 2): we build the translation of the fork $F_{[1,\mathbf{1}]}$ by $(3,3)$ (in gray) then a collision occurs with P and thus P is fragile.



Figure 145: Initialization for finding the second stake of Lemma 8.8: we only represent $P_{[1,\mathbf{8}]}$. We suppose that the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(0,4)$ can be assembled using the first stake. If $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{8}]}$ and $P_{[\mathbf{5},\mathbf{8}]} - (0,4)$ does not intersect we can conclude with Lemma 4.14 (Jail Lemma). Otherwise, either $P_{\mathbf{6}} = P_{\mathbf{7}} + (0,4)$ or P is fragile. We represent here a case where $\mathbf{6} < \mathbf{7}$ (the other case is identical). Thus we can try to attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]}$ by $(0,4)$ at the end of $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$. Three cases can occur, they are illustrated in the five following Figures.



Figure 146: Illustration for finding the second stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 1): we can attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]}$ by $(4,0)$ at the end of $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ of Figure 145. In this case, we have found the second stake: $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ and this stake fits in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^s)$. The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]}$ by $(4,0)$ is represented in grey.



Figure 147: Illustration for finding the second stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 2 part 1): we cannot attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]}$ by $(0,4)$ at the end of the segment $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ of Figure 145. In this case, a collision occurs in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^-)$. The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{7},\mathbf{9}]}$ by $(0,4)$ is represented in grey.



Figure 148: Illustration for finding the second stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 2, part 2): the tile $P_{\mathbf{5}}$ is not in $f^r(\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B})$ while the tile $P_{\mathbf{9}}$ is in $\mathcal{B}^- + \mathcal{B}$. Then P does not satisfies the reset constraint.



Figure 149: Illustration for finding the second stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 3 part 1): we cannot attach the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{7},|P|]}$ by $(0,4)$ at the end of $P_{[1,\mathbf{6}]}$ of Figure 145. In this case, a collision occurs with $P_{[\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6}]}$. The translation of $P_{[\mathbf{6},|P|]}$ by $(0,4)$ is represented in grey.



Figure 150: Illustration for finding the second stake of Lemma 8.8 (case 3 part 2): we build the translation of $P_{[\mathbf{2},|P|]}$ by $-(0,4)$ (in gray) using the first stake then a collision occurs with P and thus P is fragile. We only represent the path assembly P from $P_{\mathbf{7}}$ until the collision.